

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 7 November 1985

The **SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT AND
EMPLOYMENT BILL

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer)**: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the sittings of the House to be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the Government Management and Employment Bill.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENT (JOINT SERVICES) BILL

At 2.2 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to Amendment No 1:

That the House of Assembly no longer insist on its disagreement to this amendment.

As to Amendments Nos 2 and 6:

That the Legislative Council no longer insist on these amendments, but make in lieu thereof the following amendments to the Bill:

Clause 7, page 4—

After line 38—Insert new paragraph as follows:

(ba) the Catering Division;

Page 5—

After line 2—Insert new paragraph as follows:

(ba) in relation to the Catering Division—the Catering Manager shall be the chief officer;

Lines 3 and 4—Leave out 'the secretary to the Committee' and insert 'the person for the time being acting as secretary to the Committee'.

Clause 26, page 15—

Lines 7 and 8—Leave out all words in these lines and insert:

(e) the Catering Manager; and

(f) the chief officer of the Joint Services Division.

Line 13—Leave out 'Three' and insert 'Four'.

As to Amendments Nos 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9:

That the Legislative Council no longer insist on these amendments.

PETITION: CRIME

A petition signed by 163 residents of South Australia praying that the House would legislate to increase the penalties for crime, provide greater resources to the police, and reject the automatic release of prisoners was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

PETITION: NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

A petition signed by 98 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to implement a neighbourhood watch program in the electorate of Unley during 1986-87 was presented by Mr Mayes.

Petition received.

QUESTION

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

ASER PROJECT

In reply to **Mr BECKER** (29 October).

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: ASER is not directly contracted with any drafting service in relation to the convention centre. The contractor for fabrication of the convention centre steelwork has subcontracted the shop drawings to a drafting service. The ASER project management team is aware that there have been some misunderstandings related to payment for work outside the original contract. ASER understands that the dispute is now virtually resolved and that the contractor has made an interim payment to the drafting service. There has been no 'tardiness' by the project team. The drafting for the convention centre steelwork is almost complete and there is no suggestion that there will be delays to the schedule.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Corporate Affairs Commission, Report, 1984-85.

QUESTION TIME

STATE INDUSTRY

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier make representations to the Prime Minister tomorrow evening on the effect of the continuing fall in the value of the Australian dollar on South Australian industry? The Prime Minister will be in Adelaide tomorrow to address the annual dinner of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. South Australian business people will seek assurances from him that the Federal Government will do everything possible to protect local industry from the effects of the continuing decline in the value of the Australian dollar.

The key motor vehicle and white goods industries are under particular pressure. About 15 per cent of the components for locally manufactured motor vehicles in South Australia are imported, and the declining dollar is forcing up their prices. I have been advised that since the beginning of this year the cost of manufacturing a Commodore has increased by \$500, as a direct result of the weakening dollar. In the white goods industry, all electronic motors and switching gear is imported, and there will be increasing pressure on prices in this industry as well, which is a key employer in this State. On top of this are the tax decisions made by the Federal Labor Government that will directly affect the ability of local car manufacturers to sell their products to company fleets.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: I had discussions about this issue on the telephone with the Prime Minister yesterday. It is no doubt a matter of concern to the Federal Government. There is also no doubt that the matter is being treated with the highest priority. Whatever the advantage is of export orientation from the changing value, there is no question that the instability that is current in relation to the value of the dollar is affecting forward planning and investment decisions. The Federal Government is well aware of that. The Federal Treasurer in fact at this very time has been holding a series of meetings in both the United States and Britain, talking about the true state of the Australian economy. The extraordinary thing is that the falling value of the dollar is against the background of a very strong Australian economy. Unfortunately, it is the statements of

people like the Federal Opposition Leader and a number of businessmen which are causing uncertainty in the international markets. I would have thought that in an area like this it was not in their interests—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will put it positively: it would be in their interests to get behind the successful economic policies of the Federal Government.

AUDIO TACTILE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING UNITS

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Minister of Transport investigate the feasibility of the installation of audio tactile units at actuated pedestrian crossings as they are installed in future in the metropolitan area, also taking into account actuated pedestrian crossings already operating? Following representations to the Marion council for the installation of an actuated pedestrian crossing on Morphett Road, adjacent to Folkestone Road, I also made a request to have an audio tactile unit installed for the benefit of visually impaired persons living adjacent to the crossing. A request for this has been made by parents and those with visual impairment who have difficulty negotiating the road when catching a bus to go shopping, etc.

In making inquiries about the potential users for such a crossing the Australian National Council of and for the Blind (South Australian Branch) was approached, and it provided evidence of the number of known blind and partially blind people living in the area. Also, Dover High School provided evidence of need, as has 13 visually impaired students integrated into the school system. On this evidence the Marion council is installing the actuated pedestrian crossing, including in it the audio tactile unit. This work will be completed in the next couple of weeks. I understand that this is one of the first of these to be installed by a council in the metropolitan area. From the evidence, it would seem that consideration of this proposal would greatly benefit the independence of these people.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for her question, and commend her for bringing this matter before the Parliament and to my attention. I certainly commend the honourable member for the work that she has done in her own area in relation to the assistance that she provides as the local member for Parliament to both visually impaired and the hearing impaired residents in the area that she represents. I also commend the Marion City Council for the action that it has taken. Certainly, I think this initiative ought to be followed by many of our suburban councils which have pedestrian activated crossings in busy areas.

Of course they would not have the crossings unless they were in a busy area—I know that that follows. I am prepared to do the investigation that the honourable member has requested and have officers of my department assess the benefits that could accrue to those people in our community who are less fortunate than others and who need assistance in the crossing of many of our busy urban arterial roads. I commend the honourable member and the Marion City Council.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: How many times have you done that?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Twice. I will take the action that the honourable member requests of me.

WAGE DISCOUNTING

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier be asking the Federal Minister for Industrial Relations and the

ACTU to consider additional wage discounting in view of the continuing decline in the Australian dollar? As part of the wages accord, there is to be a 2 per cent discount in the April national wage case for the inflationary effect of the depreciation of the dollar. This deal was struck between the ACTU and the Federal Government before the dollar fell to a record low against most major currencies.

A major reason for this decline has been the response of local and international money markets to the Federal Government's decision not to press for any discounting of this week's national wage decision. To ensure that the competitive position of South Australian industry, especially small business, is not further eroded, the State Government has no option but to press the Commonwealth and the ACTU to consider an adjustment to the two-month old accord deal to secure extra wage discounting.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question is premature. Obviously we have to wait to see just what happens to the value of the dollar. Closer to the national wage case hearing a decision can be made about what is the appropriate level of discounting and whether any change needs to be made in the current agreement. There is no comparative disadvantage for South Australia—on the contrary, with the sort of wage structure we have and with our record in industrial relations, we are in a better position than the rest of Australia in a number of key industries. My Government certainly intends to keep it that way.

JUBILEE 150

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Premier give the House some information on the impact that our Jubilee 150 celebrations will have on the hospitality and other industries in South Australia? Following the success of the Grand Prix and the boost it has given to South Australian business, several of my constituents are now looking forward with some expectation to 1986 and have asked whether the jubilee will have a similar effect on our economy.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is no question that events, conventions and festivals have a major positive effect on jobs and development in this State. Indeed, it is becoming an increasingly important sector of economic activity in South Australia. It is great to see that at last we are beginning to be recognised for those benefits that all of us who have lived in this State have recognised but have taken a long time selling on a general basis to the rest of Australia and countries overseas.

It is certainly true that in some areas, such as the arts, we have a pre-eminence and a high international standing, but we are now broadening into a whole range of other areas with very beneficial results, and 1986 will provide a focus and means of enhancing that. The Grand Prix can be seen as an international curtain-raiser to that event. The economic impact of the jubilee events is going to be very substantial, indeed. The figures themselves are quite staggering. I am advised that at the moment more than 250 events, including 39 international conferences and more than 100 national conferences, are scheduled.

That means, in rough figures, that more than 84 000 delegates will be coming to South Australia, and 405 visitor nights have been booked in accommodation houses in this State. I am not sure whether that figure is correct, but certainly the 84 000 delegates is just the current count of the estimated impact of those conventions. The visitor convention activities alone should mean a minimum of \$40 million spent directly here in South Australia, and indirectly ought to generate another \$113 million expenditure throughout 1986. That is quite a major impact, because of course

that money is being brought into this economy and spent here from interstate and overseas.

There will be many national sporting championships and a number of international sporting championships which will have a similar impact on the State. I think we can see how the visitor accommodation tourist industry will be affected in a very major way. One industry that is of particular interest to the honourable member that is worth mentioning is the printing industry, because he certainly has a close knowledge and appreciation of that important industry. This is just one of the impacts. There will be, and it already can be seen, major benefit to that industry from the work being carried out.

The Jubilee 150 office, local government, State Government departments, community groups, and private industries are all involved in printing material, brochures and pamphlets in relation to the jubilee activities. Jubilee 150 reports that over 30 printers have been given an opportunity to quote for their work. Twenty of them have received some work already. Wakefield Press has under production a program of more than a dozen books, and, with other books that will be published during the year, something like a total of 30, so that represents a real boom into that important industry, and obviously our printing industry will not only make a major contribution but will benefit greatly from the jubilee 1986 activities.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Mr Speaker, I do not recall your saying anything about the absence of the Minister of Education, but I wish to address a question to him. Is the Minister here? That is what I want to know.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I want to ask a question of the Minister of Education.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. He is out of order. He knows from the long time that he has been here and his experience in Cabinet that a question may be taken by any Minister on the bench. The honourable member for Newland.

Mr KLUNDER: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member for Davenvont wish to take a point of order?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Mr Speaker, I am on my feet waiting to ask a question.

An honourable member: You have missed out.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have called the next questioner. The honourable member for Newland.

WORLD CUP SOCCER MATCH

Mr KLUNDER: My question is directed to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. Do the Minister and the Government support the application by the South Australian Soccer Federation to the Australian Soccer Federation to host the World Cup game against Scotland in South Australia at Football Park?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The answer is 'Yes'. Certainly we support the application by the South Australian Soccer Federation to host at Football Park what I believe is probably the most important game of soccer ever played in Australia at Football Park. I might explain, for the benefit of the member for Newland and the House, that originally the Australian Soccer Federation had chosen the venue in Melbourne, but because of some difficulties associated with the Melbourne Cricket Ground, that is now in doubt.

On the basis of our experience with international teams which have played at Football Park—I think Tottenham Hotspurs played there last year or the year before, and Italian Juventus has also played there—and the fact that

Football Park can accommodate 55 000 to 60 000 people, it would be the ideal venue for a night game against Scotland in the World Cup. Certainly, we support it. I have spoken to the Secretary of the South Australian Soccer Federation (Mr Nickolich) and advised him that, if we can do anything to support its application for the playing of that important game at Football Park on 4 December, we will do so.

COM OUTPUT MICROFILMER AND DUPLICATOR

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Premier say why the State Government is preparing tender documents to purchase a COM output microfilmer and duplicator at a cost of about \$600 000 when this equipment and service is already available through existing private companies, which will be required to sack staff if the Government proceeds with the purchase? The State Government is preparing tender documents—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Before I have even explained the question, the Premier has instructed his Minister simply to get a report, as the answer. I will proceed with my explanation. The State Government is preparing tender documents to purchase a COM output microfilmer and duplicator. This will allow data to go straight from the computer to microfiche. The equipment will cost the State Government over \$600 000 if it has the usual back-up facilities.

This work is currently being done by private companies and, if the work is done internally by the Government, they will be required to sack staff. Government work accounts for about 40 per cent of the total work done in South Australia in this area. When the Labor Government established the Government microfilming bureau it took work away from the private sector. That Government bureau is now charging more than private industry is charging for the same work. The fear of private industry is that—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I would have hoped that even the member who just interjected from the other side of the House would be concerned about this. Private industry fears that the same will occur as happened with microfilming: that it will now start to occur with the COM output microfilmer and duplicator. The Government service will cost more and people in the private sector will be sacked to make way for that Government service.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I make two points. First, I initiated the brief discussion between the Premier and me because it is my area of responsibility. I asked whether I should respond to this question, which is appropriate. Secondly, it is interesting that the member has not been prepared to tell the House which department is involved so that any investigation that might need to be undertaken could be directed very quickly. However, as I am the Minister responsible for the Supply and Tender Board, I feel that I am aware of the circumstances to which the honourable member has addressed himself. In his normal fashion, the honourable member is exaggerating.

I will check out the matter. I suspect that I am aware of the department to which he refers. But, if he is not prepared to tell the Parliament to which department he is referring, I am not in a position to respond. However, I will have the matter investigated through the Supply and Tender Board, which is the appropriate authority to deal with matters of this kind. When I am in possession of the report, I will give it to Parliament.

DISABLED PERSONS PARKING

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Transport review the eligibility of persons for disabled persons parking permits? In 1984, one of my constituents was forced to cease work because he had emphysema. He gets very breathless with minimum exertion and even tying shoe laces can cause discomfort. When my constituent sought an application for a disabled parking permit he saw the appropriate doctors and was asked by one whether he could get on and off a bus. He said, 'Of course I can.' On that basis, they refused him the permit. As he put it to me, walking to the bus is an impossibility.

On 6 September my constituent was refused a permit and on 22 October he was requested to return his licence, as he would now be treated as a person with a disability and consequently his licence would be renewed each 12 months. He pointed out to me that the first two persons over the line in the Adelaide to Melbourne marathon were people in wheelchairs who were eligible for this disabled persons permit. He indicated to me that he would not be able to participate in a marathon in a wheelchair, let alone walk a portion of the distance.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question which, quite honestly, I do not believe should have generated the sort of mirth that erupted in the Opposition benches. This is a very important matter, and I commend the honourable member for bringing it to my attention.

If the honourable member can advise me of the name of his constituent, I am quite happy to look at the circumstances surrounding this case. My understanding is that, in relation to the granting of parking permits for disabled persons, the department needs to have the expert advice of a medical practitioner. However, that does not mean that once a decision is made it cannot be reviewed.

I accept the honourable member's point that in relation to emphysema one does not necessarily have any visible physical disability, but one can be extremely disabled because of the debilitating and weakening effect of that disease. I acknowledge that it would be an advantage to emphysema sufferers to be able to park in the disabled persons parking spots when they go shopping. I will look at this matter. I will ask the honourable member to give me the full details, and I will see what we can do to assist his constituent to live a fulfilling life by using his motor vehicle and having access to shopping and business activities.

ROXBY DOWNS PROJECT

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I direct my question to the Premier. Is the Federal Government's floor price for uranium putting a question mark over the future of the Roxby Downs project and, if so, is the South Australian Government seeking a reduction in that price? The Federal Minister for Resources and Energy (Senator Evans) has revealed that the current floor price is being reviewed. This followed a report in yesterday's *Financial Review* that the price was a crucial factor in helping to ensure a go ahead for the Roxby Downs project. The report said that the price would have to be reduced if the project was to sell the minimum 2 000 tonnes of uranium per annum needed to make the project viable. I ask the Premier whether the Government is aware of any current concerns about prices preventing the joint venturers giving a go ahead for the project next month and, if he is, whether he is making any representations to the Federal Government about the matter.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am well aware of it, and it has been under discussion for some months. The statement

made by the Federal Minister that the matter is being reviewed indicates that considerable progress has been achieved. There is no question that the current price of uranium in world markets for those countries seeking contracts (and currently there are not many of them) is lower than the floor price currently applied under governmental rules.

In regard to writing contracts in uranium (and it is well known that the joint venturers have been working in international markets to tie up contracts), if this spot price remains in place in its current form there are difficulties in achieving the sort of price for the contracts that they seek. This has been brought to the attention of the Federal Government and naturally that Government, like our own, is keen for development to proceed and it is looking at the matter on that basis.

HILLBANK LAND

Mr M.J. EVANS: Will the Minister of Transport give the House an undertaking that no precipitate action will be taken by the Highways Department to sell surplus land in the transport corridor that runs adjacent to the hills face zone at Hillbank? The Highways Department, which has held this land for over 15 years, recently announced proposals for the sale of the now surplus land. The Munno Para council and the Minister for Environment and Planning are preparing a supplementary development plan for the area, and the residents of Hillbank Estate are most concerned that the land should not be sold for unrestrained development before the supplementary plan takes effect later this year. I should appreciate the Minister's giving that assurance to the residents of Hillbank.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I will certainly examine it. I have had contact from a number of citizens, including the local member and other members, about the Hillbank land. They have asked that no action be taken until planning decisions have been made on future development in the area. A difficult problem faces the Highways Department and me, as Minister, in not continuing to sell land in excess of requirements: land purchased as a result of federal funding for road construction is required, under the terms of the agreement with the Federal Government, to be returned to road construction. Every year the Highways Department plans to sell off so much land and the proceeds from such sales are built into the department's budget. This year we have built many millions of dollars into that budget, depending on the sale of the land at prices that the department considers appropriate.

As we have a good valuation service in the department, such valuations almost certainly can be expected to be achieved. However, I take the honourable member's point, and I am aware of the Government's desire to develop a second generation park land concept. I take it from the honourable member that Hillbank could well be part of that. Planning decisions must be made, and I will discuss the matter with my colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning. However, in undertaking to consider this matter as the honourable member requests, I want to impress on the House and on the honourable member's constituents that the Highways Department and the Minister of Transport have certain budget constraints that we must consider seriously, so that we can build and maintain the roads as we are charged to do. Within that requirement, I will undertake to do as the honourable member has asked.

TEENAGE CHILDREN

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare outline his department's policy concerning teenage children leaving home and seeking advice from the department? Does the department have a policy that effectively excludes parents from discussions or attempts at reconciliation with their children? Within the past few weeks my colleagues and I have received some alarming correspondence from several families who feel that the Department for Community Welfare has acted without first considering the rights of parents in cases of children leaving home.

One case concerns a 14-year-old girl who left home and was placed in another home by an officer of the department. It was only after the child had been placed in another home that the officer contacted the child's mother. The mother expressed great concern that her daughter had been placed in a home where (and I quote) 'she was allowed out all through the day and at nights'. The child was allowed to return to her parents only after a contract, drawn up by the department, was signed by the child and her father. This contract, among other things, included an agreement by the father that the 14-year-old would be allowed to attend a disco on a given date.

It has been put to me by the mother that it is quite extraordinary for a State Government to draw up contracts between teenagers and their parents as a condition of their returning to their family home. In this particular instance, that contract has resulted in further difficulties for the family concerned, as the 14-year-old is the oldest of six children, and the others are now seeking similar rights to attend evening functions on their own.

Another case involves a 16-year-old girl whose father alleges that she left home on the advice of, and with money from, the department, following the child's assertions that her father was violent towards her. The father says:

At no time has anyone from the department sought information from myself nor her three sisters as to whether the accusation was correct or not.

Since leaving home the child has lost her job, quit trade school, and her father has reason to believe she is now involved in prostitution and drug and alcohol abuse. In view of the serious and quite extraordinary nature of the claims in just these two letters, I ask the Minister to outline what the department's attitude is, and directives are, to staff involved in these situations, and why the rights of these two parents appear to have been disregarded by Department for Community Welfare officers.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: First, I suggest that before the honourable member draws final conclusions she might like to shed all the facts relating to these cases. The honourable member has not contacted me in relation to the other side of these stories. For obvious reasons I cannot relate to the House or the public all the details of what often are very sad situations in the community. The department is faced with very difficult situations indeed when children come to the department seeking assistance in these circumstances. However, I can tell the honourable member that the department's first priority is to reconcile a child with his or her family: that is the most appropriate place for a child to be.

The Hon. H. Allison: You obviously didn't do that on these two occasions.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I suggest that the honourable member should give us the opportunity to look at all the facts in these circumstances. If members want to make public statements and draw conclusions without looking at the other side of the story, they will be judged by that. In each of these cases there is an internal peer review of actions that are taken by the department, and there are external

procedures undertaken, where a child is placed in an institution or a foster situation by the courts. These checks and balances ensure that proper decision making occurs.

About 1 300 children a year run away from home in this State, and I understand that about 300 children seek assistance in one form or another from the Department for Community Welfare. Of those children there are very few cases where it is not possible to return a child to his or her home situation due to some form of abuse or alleged abuse of the child having occurred or some other reason giving rise to fears for the safety, health and well-being of the child. In such circumstances a set of procedures apply, and the various authorities responsible for these matters investigate the situation. Of course that is the proper course of action that should occur.

I understand that in probably five or six cases a year the whereabouts of a child are not revealed to the child's parents, and members could well envisage the circumstances in which that would occur. I repeat: the overriding commitment of the department is to return children to their family situations, and certainly the thrust of our work is aimed in that direction. However, if the honourable member would like to give me the circumstances of each of those two cases to which she refers, I will have them investigated and we can look at the situation.

Just last week the member for Torrens raised in this House the question of another situation where a family had been given assistance by the department, and sought to slur the work of the department, I believe, in not seeking out all the facts in that case. I sought detailed information from the honourable member, who has refused to hand it to me. I have had to have enormous investigations carried out within the department, and when my officers rang the honourable member he said that he would have to check with his informant as to whether the information could be released. He has chosen not to do so. I investigate every one of these matters, as it is important that we clarify the situation in each of the cases. I warn honourable members that, where they seek to draw rapid conclusions and have only heard one side of the story, it may be better to seek all the facts before so doing.

TAXIS

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Transport report to the House on the impact of the one-plate system on the price of taxi plates, the level of taxi fares, and whether he has received any complaints about overcrowding? I have received from Mr W. Sievers, the Secretary of the White Plate Operators Association, a letter in which he implied that overcrowding is occurring in city areas and that the plate system instituted by the Government has not caused the price rise in the plates that are now for sale through the market. He has also inferred that there is an imminent price rise in fares as a consequence of this system that has been so successfully introduced.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. The three points that he raised related to the price of plates, the level of taxi fares and overcrowding in Adelaide streets. There has been a dramatic increase in the price of plates and I know that Mr Sievers has argued that the increase is not as a result of the introduction of the one-plate system. I suspect that, whilst the one-plate system has had a considerable impact, to some extent Mr Sievers might be correct because in the nature of things there is an appreciation in the price of most profitable businesses. At the moment the taxi industry in South Australia comes into that category of a profitable business. So, there would be a normal increase in the value of the plates.

It is indisputable that the creation of the one-plate system, supported by both sides of this House, has had a beneficial effect upon those prices. It has been quite dramatic since that decision was taken. In regard to the level of taxi fares, I do not believe that it was ever said that the taxi fares in Adelaide would decrease as a result of the introduction of the one-plate system—that would have been an unreasonable expectation—but we would expect a slowing down in the rate of increase of fares in Adelaide to such an extent that, within a short few years taxi fares in Adelaide will be at the same level as interstate fares. I understand we still have the most expensive taxi fares in Australia. It is very difficult sometimes to compare city with city because in some respects we are comparing apples with oranges. In so far as we are able to compare the fares, it is evident that we have the most expensive fares in Australia but there will be a slowing down in the rate of increase in those fares.

No evidence has been brought to me as Minister of overcrowding and lack of available taxis within the square mile of the city. Certainly over the Grand Prix for two days such overcrowding occurred, but one cannot build a taxi industry or a public transport system to cope with the peaks that occur once, twice, or three times a year whilst for the other 362 days the custom is back to normal.

So, we have to expect that at peak periods there may be a shortage of available taxis. My information is that the industry is coping very well under the new system to the benefit of the participants in the taxi industry and more particularly to the benefit of the commuters and the citizens of South Australia who are getting a better service and who can look forward to a decrease in the rate of increases of taxi fares.

ETSA TARIFFS

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy make the necessary arrangements with the Electricity Trust of South Australia for consumers who are dissatisfied with their electricity connection charge to have the opportunity of obtaining a quote from a qualified electrical contractor? There are many instances where consumers are quoted what would appear to be exorbitant charges to have power connected to their home or property, and with little or no redress. It has been put to me that, if job specifications were provided at the consumer's request and a private quote obtained, in many instances a saving of thousands of dollars would be achieved for the consumer.

Members on this side of the House, particularly those in country areas, where the cost of connection on many occasions is much greater and consequently the number of instances is probably far greater, can quote numerous examples where we believe that if the consumer was given the opportunity of obtaining a quote from a private contractor in the same way as we have requested that this be allowed to occur in relation to E&WS connections, many thousands of dollars could be saved for the consumer.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: There may be some merit in the honourable member's request. I will certainly look at what aspects are contained in it. I am a bit surprised at what seemed to me the rather denigrating attitude to ETSA employees and staff in relation to the quotes and the estimates for jobs that they are providing for people.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The honourable member asked a question. If he will just be a little more polite, he may get some information that he sought. My experience with ETSA has been that it is a very efficient organisation, very responsive, through its regional engineers, to consumer needs. Many members on the other side of the House and on this

side have raised queries with me, and all, to my knowledge, have been resolved by an approach in the region. What has been suggested by the honourable member I think is not entirely ruled out even at the present time. I am not saying that in respect of a quotation from a contractor, but some of these jobs where power is to be provided can be on an arranged basis. That is what I can say to the honourable member.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: When they have requested the right to get a private contractor, it has been denied.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: If the honourable member would give me a specific example—I do not mean publicly—I will certainly follow it up. As I said, I will have the question examined, but I do not accept the implied innuendo in his question that ETSA necessarily is costing the consumers to whom he referred all those extra thousands of dollars. I would be very surprised if that were the case.

GRAND PRIX BUSINESS BENEFITS

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Premier tell the House whether any preliminary data is available on the flow-on benefits to South Australian business and industry from the Adelaide Grand Prix? I have been told that many people recognised the obvious benefits to industries such as the accommodation and hospitality industry in general, wholesale food distributors and beverage manufacturers. However, some anecdotal information which has come to the attention of some members in this House and which has been brought to my attention is that some other industries which many of us did not recognise as beneficiaries of some spin-offs of the Grand Prix have in fact received benefits. I share with the House two particular cases: one is that about an hour and a half ago a taxi driver told me—

Mr Lewis: Are you asking a question or answering one?

Ms LENEHAN: No, I am asking a question. A taxi driver told me that he had driven three interstate businessmen—as well as many other people—who were at the Grand Prix. All three of them individually had said that they would return to South Australia with their families—in one instance for a four week period at Christmas. One of them also commented that he did not know about Adelaide and the sorts of things that were available in terms of tourism in South Australia.

The second anecdotal story revolves around another industry and relates to one group of people in a corporate box. They are alleged to have spent in the vicinity of \$20 000 in the fashion industry in South Australia. Members may be interested to know that South Australia has one of the leading fashion houses in Australia. This has given an incredible impetus and boost to the fashion industry in this State. I am rather sad that members opposite find this amusing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will decide these matters. The honourable member is, to use her own words, stretching the fabric of the question a little too much.

Ms LENEHAN: I am sorry. Thank you, Sir, for bringing me back to order. I have been told that many South Australians do not realise that many industries and businesses have received enormous spin-offs from the benefits of the Grand Prix. I am interested—as I thought other members would be—in knowing whether there are any preliminary estimates or data about effects of such flow-ons to particular industries. Does the Premier have any preliminary information or statistics in relation to this matter?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is important that a serious attempt is made to quantify the benefits across the whole range of an event such as this. As the member points out, there is considerable anecdotal evidence of expenditure pat-

terns, tourist levels, and so on. What is being done is—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I hope that the honourable member enjoyed his few days at the Grand Prix. I was very glad to see him there. I hope that that indicates that he has some understanding of the size and importance of the event. It is certainly important that these things are pinned down and quantified, and that exercise is taking place. At this stage, I do not think it would be wise to try to use figures because the whole purpose of the exercise is to try to get some hard data which will also give us the opportunity to assess just what is the impact of our marketing programs: in tourism, for instance, what needs to be done and what target areas can best be pursued. Obviously there is an ongoing program under way, but to try to analyse a particular event means that much work has to be done. It is under way and I hope that we can produce some definitive statistics which will indicate the precise economic impact that occurred in 1985.

HILLS RESERVOIR

Mr S.G. EVANS: Will the Minister of Water Resources say when it is planned to build the next reservoir in the Adelaide Hills and at what site? Three sites have been chosen over the years for the next reservoir:—one on the Finnis River; one at Baker's Gully at the end of Penneys Hill Road below Clarendon (near the Velocette motor cycle club track); and the other is above the Clarendon Weir between the weir and the existing Mount Bold Reservoir. In the early 1970s it was stated that the Clarendon reservoir would be built and completed by 1977. Of course, we all know that that did not occur. From the information that has been given to me, I understand that there was some trouble with the rock structure and that in fact the whole hill below may have moved with the weight of the water.

I believe that activities have occurred around the Finnis site in recent times, but people who have land that has a catchment flow into the Onkaparinga River below the Clarendon weir but above the site of the Baker's Gully reservoir have expressed some concern to me. If the plans for the Baker's Gully reservoir are to be scrapped for all time, the land that is held for water catchment preservation below Clarendon no longer needs to be held for that purpose. Many families have their properties tied up under that classification, perhaps unfairly so. I ask the Minister when is the next dam to be built and at what time. At the same time, the Minister may care to explain whether or not some of the sites are to be used and, if they are not, the classification of land usage may possibly be changed.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: There are no immediate plans by the Government or the department to build an additional metropolitan reservoir.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Not for 25 years?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: For a fair number of years, taking us into the next century. Two things predominate, and they are the pattern of consumption and something that we cannot predict entirely, namely, the future growth of the metropolitan area of Adelaide. Current indications are that there is no need to immediately expend Government money on capital works for an additional metropolitan reservoir, because current metropolitan reservoirs are at capacity and can fulfil our needs for the next 20 to 25 years.

The department holds areas of land in the sites mentioned by the member for Fisher. As a consequence, I have received correspondence from the honourable member, particularly in relation to Baker's Gully, if I remember correctly, and the future use of that land. I do not recall the exact content of his letter or my reply, but I think basically it was that

the land is being kept for water catchment purposes and that, if the situation changes in relation to the pattern of consumption or if there is an extension in the growth of the metropolitan area of Adelaide, either that area or the other two sites may have to be utilised for the purpose of a reservoir.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: No determination has been made as to whether or not they will be needed. If we allowed them to be used for other purposes, we would not be keeping our options open for the future. I will investigate the possibility of changing the classification of that land for other uses, but currently there is no expectation that the sites need to be utilised for a metropolitan reservoir.

In these situations one must look ahead for a certain amount of time to ensure an adequate water supply. No-one can predict with any great degree of certainty what will occur within the next 20 years. If we could do that, we probably would not be members of Parliament. There are no immediate plans to build a metropolitan reservoir, but I will inquire in relation to future use of those areas mentioned by the member for Fisher to ascertain the intentions of the Government and the Engineering & Water Supply Department.

WIND ENERGY

Mr WHITTEN: I direct this question to the Minister of Mines and Energy, and I assure him that I will not worry him with questions in future. Can the Minister give the House up-to-date details of the Government's wind energy monitoring program? Earlier, the Government announced that it was approaching the question of wind generated electricity in South Australia by instituting a program of measuring wind velocities and frequencies. I am greatly concerned about the generation of electricity by wind because of the cheapness of such power. I would therefore appreciate the Minister's reply and hope that he will not have to answer many more questions from me.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: In thanking the honourable member for his question, I recall questions that he has asked me as the Minister holding various other portfolios as well as my present one, but to my knowledge he has never worried me with his questions over the years. On the contrary, he has demonstrated a genuine compassion and concern for his constituents and has earned the respect of all members of the House because of the untiring way in which he has fought for his constituents. In keeping with his character, the honourable member was kind enough to let me know in advance of his interest in wind generated electricity, so I can now give the House considerable information on that topic.

Earlier, I advised members that originally there were five sites on Fleurieu Peninsula that were to be equipped with monitoring equipment to measure the wind parameters at those locations. Since then, 19 of the proposed 28 wind monitoring sites have been equipped. These stretch from the State's South-East coast to beyond Ceduna and as far north as Wilpena Pound. Another site will be equipped tomorrow and another four, in the State's Far North, will have monitoring installed next week. Another three will have equipment installed before the end of the month, and the final one (making a total of 28) will be installed on Kangaroo Island in early December.

The program has been warmly welcomed by landholders, and the installation team has reported helpfulness and co-operation everywhere, which speaks well of South Australian landholders. SENRAC and ETSA are currently examining the initial funding that will be required to continue

the monitoring program after November, and that approval is expected soon. Up to the present, speaking from memory, the funding involved is \$80 000. The review of existing wind power technology has begun, and the actual matching of the performance of that equipment in a computer simulation of the situation in South Australia will get under way next March. Therefore, towards the end of 1986 we expect to have amassed much information on the economics of wind generated electricity, and I expect then to be able confidently to take to Cabinet a submission for a demonstration of a wind energy program which could include the installation of generating towers.

PARLIAMENT (JOINT SERVICES) BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

The passage of this legislation has been fairly lengthy, and I am delighted to report to the House that at long last there is agreement on a new structure that will benefit not only members of Parliament and staff but the operations of Parliament itself. Some compromises have had to be made by members both here and in another place to reach this agreement. It was essential that the Bill be passed even if, in the view of some, it might be imperfect. The structure had to be created so that any questions arising could be addressed at the appropriate level.

This is innovative legislation, and there will almost certainly be a growing process within the structure itself and within the new Joint Services Committee. Inevitably, that will require some changes, and whether those changes be legislative or administrative will be a matter for the committee, for the Presiding Officers, and for the Clerks of both Houses to decide.

The House of Assembly has agreed to no longer insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1. This means that the secretarial services to be used by the Joint Services Committee will be provided by each House when it is the turn of that House to have its Presiding Officer as Chairman of the committee. This will raise questions concerning resources, and such questions can be addressed at the appropriate time. With the new structure in place, there will be a better understanding of the workload and of the resources needed, and I am sure that the appropriate recommendations will be made.

The House of Assembly felt strongly that there was no need to have the Catering Manager as part of the secretariat to the committee. In fact, the Catering Manager has now been designated 'Chief Officer of the Catering Division' and as such has been included on the advisory committee. The necessary provisions are included to implement that recommendation.

The Legislative Council did not insist on its amendments Nos 3, 4, 5, 8 and 9, all of which were strongly opposed by the House of Assembly. I believe that the Legislative Council's action is appropriate. Although I have not had as close an association with this legislation as have many of my colleagues who have lived with it for some time, from my experience in the short time in which I have been involved I express appreciation to all those, both members of Parliament and staff members, who have worked hard to achieve this agreement. The Bill has not had an easy passage, but

the final result, although not one that meets with everyone's approval, is a workable solution, and I believe that, in the knowledge that goodwill exists within the Parliament, it will result in a much more appropriate structure, improved management, better facilities, and a much happier Parliament all round. I commend to members the report from the conference.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I wish I could be as confident as the Minister that the measure will prove to be effective. When one starts with a hand tied behind one's back and both feet tied together, there are difficulties. However, with goodwill and, it is hoped, the correct attitude exhibited by those who are charged with the responsibility of furthering the proposal, as well as with the agreement of members of both sides of the House in the event that amendment is necessary, there might be an opportunity in this measure to assist the staff of the parliamentary family in a very practical way.

This measure arose from the fact that, although we are in a sense the premier body of the State, being responsible for determining laws and putting into place directions for the community, in relation to the Parliament House staff and the method of management that bound officers of the House we were back in the last decade. The Joint House Committee Act was brought into effect in 1944 and has not been amended in any significant way since then. Over time, it has proven to be deficient in a number of areas, one involving some doubt about employment guarantees for those who work for the Parliament (this may apply, for that matter, to any governmental institution).

In part, the Bill's implementation relies on the availability of resources, although no clear indication can be given by the Government that resources will be adequate for the purposes of the new Act. It has been suggested that from the current resources of the two Houses it will be possible for the person who will coordinate activities, to be known as the Secretary of the Joint Services Committee, to fulfil that role. I would not want to see placed on the shoulders of any member of the staff of this place an additional burden of duties beyond that which that person believes that he or she can adequately undertake, or anyone coerced into undertaking or continuing a role which would be detrimental to their prime employment.

It will be necessary for the Government of the day to implement the new Act in stages. The first stage will have to involve representatives of both Houses of Parliament meeting and discussing how the structure created under this measure can come into effective operation and identifying what is required in that process. Goodwill will be an integral part of that process, and undoubtedly an element of goodwill has already been exhibited, otherwise this measure would not have reached its present stage.

I was the Chairman of the Joint House Committee over a period of time, and I understand, as I am sure the current Chairman of the Joint House Committee does, that it is not always easy within the framework of this place to effectively and correctly provide justice to members of staff or an adequate service to members, whom the House staff seek to support. Members of the proposed Joint Services Committee will have to undertake in-depth discussions on various matters. I commend to members the report originally prepared by the Presiding Officers, working with consultants from the Public Service Board, and also the report of the joint select committee which led to the introduction of this Bill.

I strongly urge members of the proposed Joint Services Committee not to approach their task with any preconceived ideas. It will be in the best interests of the staff and members of Parliament if the requirements of the services are appreciated before drafting provisions relating specifi-

cally to those services. The current Joint House Committee Act will remain in existence until all of the new Act is proclaimed. I believe that the members of the Joint Services Committee will fulfil their role admirably in providing just and equitable treatment to all members of the staff.

Some questions have been raised concerning the employment of certain staff members. Certainly, these people have had a role to fulfil and have provided an adequate service to members of both Houses and to other members of the staff, albeit working under some difficulties. This matter should be proceeded with slowly (I do not mean that three years hence it should still be in the making; I am thinking in terms of weeks and months) rather than seeking to have the whole structure in place next week or the week after.

I hope that those entrusted with the responsibility of serving in the next Parliament will take heed of this counsel, which I offer sincerely, based on experience over a period and with due recognition of the great difficulties that have occurred over many years of parliamentary service. Some of those difficulties have arisen through lack of support, others through a lack of finance, and in other cases there has been a lack of cooperation between individuals and groups. I commend the results of the conference to members, and I look forward to a better structure, providing a better service to both staff and members in the future.

Mr GUNN: It has taken a long time to reach this stage, after a long and painful procedure. I believe that, had a little more goodwill and commonsense prevailed in certain circumstances, we could have reached the present position much earlier. The proceedings of the select committee were not without difficulty and much time was spent on small pedantic issues.

Mr Mayes interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I am saying that it was a pedantic exercise on behalf of certain people. I sincerely hope that this measure will provide the requisite benefits. My aim is to ensure that the Parliament operates in a better and more effective fashion. I want to see the services and facilities available to members improved. A great deal ought to be done to improve the facilities in this building. However, if it is going to take as long as it has to get to this stage—

Mr Mayes: I'm coming back to help you.

Mr GUNN: That is another matter: I will farewell the honourable member at another stage. At this stage, however, I express the hope that this measure will overcome some of the difficulties that have been experienced in the past. I have spent some time on the Joint House Committee, and I served on the select committee which considered this Bill and travelled to Melbourne to look at how the Victorian Parliament operates. I believe that with goodwill on all sides and a desire to make this proposal operate effectively it ought to facilitate a great improvement. If it is necessary to bring amendments before the Houses they ought to be brought as soon as possible to resolve any difficulties that arise.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands): I move: That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 19 November at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 24 October. Page 1532.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition supports the Bill. It was supported by our colleague in another place where it was first introduced, albeit clause 9 requires the specific attention of this House as it deals with monetary matters. The clause was not debated in the Committee stages in another place. Although I accept the reason behind the presentation of this Bill and recognise the technicalities which are to be corrected by it in respect of the sale of land and in the formation of the board more particularly to have deputies and a deputy chairman, I must express some concern that, at a time when the Government and indeed people generally are questioning the size of government and the size of boards and talking of deregulation, and are very clearly concerned about the totality of support services to Government instrumentalities, the very fact of the Government's increasing the size of the board from 12 to 13 does cause some concern.

It is not to be disputed that, because the thirteenth position is to be taken by a person knowledgeable in ethnic affairs and nominated by the Minister of Ethnic Affairs, it will do any harm to the board. In fact, in a community with a large ethnic population there will undoubtedly be value to the activities of the board that they will be able to directly relate to some ethnic views. However, I am advised by a number of ethnic communities that they are concerned at being singled out for special treatment or for the purpose of singular identification.

Many people in the ethnic communities would prefer that in their own rights they were nominated to boards, and not just because they were people of ethnic origin. With the passage of time I believe that that will come to be on the Parks board structure. Those who would suggest that, because the Minister of Education, the Minister of Community Welfare and the Minister of Health already have a nominee, bypass the fact that those three Ministers have direct responsibility because they have quite considerable facilities within the Parks structure. The Minister of Ethnic Affairs has no such direct structure and therefore there can be no defence in the belief that there should be of right a representative of the Minister of Ethnic Affairs.

However, having made that point, which I believe should prevail not only in relation to the Parks Act but also into various other Acts where there has been a tendency to blow out the size of boards, the Opposition is happy to give its general support. I will be asking some questions in relation to the lines as we move through. I recognise that, as this is not a Bill initiated in this House it may be necessary for the Minister to take on notice the questions I put. I have no doubt that in due course he will ensure that I am acquainted with the answers. The Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I thank the member for Light for indicating the Opposition's support for this Bill. I take the point he raised about the increase in the size of the board and his view that it would be better if the representation for our ethnic communities could be provided within the existing structure. I believe that in the fullness of time, as the honourable member has said, that will take place. At the moment we have a request that a representative from the ethnic communities who use this centre, probably to a greater extent than would the traditional Australian community, be appointed. I believe that there will be a time when the nominees of all Ministers, local government, and so on, will come from a variety of backgrounds and that the need for direct ethnic representation may not be as strong as it is now. Until that time has arrived, the Government thought it appropriate to accede to the request from the community that it be represented.

In respect to the point the honourable member made before resuming his seat about the need I may have to obtain answers to questions that he will raise during the Committee, I give him that undertaking. It is almost certain that some of the questions he asks will require further inquiry by me. I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In this and a number of other clauses I notice that decisions have been taken as a result of in-house and in-community review of the activities of the Parks community. There is certainly an element of democracy shown in several of these amendments. This one, which extends the group of staff from which nomination may be received, is one such indication. Whilst I would not debate it, I notice that when we move over to the next clause in respect of the appointment of deputy chairman, the consultation process that will take place is probably more extensive than I have ever seen previously in legislation. Democracy has certainly been given a mighty push by the ease with which the Ministry has been prepared to accept the right of the total community to play a significant part in their destiny.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Lands of the Centre.'

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I move:

Page 2, after line 29—Insert new clause 9 as follows:

9. Section 19 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out subsection (1) and substituting the following subsections:

(1) Upon the commencement of the Parks Community Centre Act Amendment Act 1985 all the land comprised in Certificates of Title Register Book Volume 3925 Folio 70, Volume 4068 Folio 686 and Volume 3609 Folio 188 shall vest in the Centre for an estate in fee simple.

(1a) The Registrar-General shall, upon application by the Centre and upon being furnished with such duplicate certificates of title or other documents as he may require, register the Centre as the proprietor of an estate in fee simple in the land vested in the Centre pursuant to this section.

(1b) No registration fee or stamp duty shall be payable by the Centre in respect of an application under subsection (1a);

and

(b) by striking out subsection (3).

Members will see that new clause 9 is already in the Bill in erased type. It would be apparent to the Committee that the need to do so is because it is a money clause, and money clauses must originate in the House of Assembly.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Members of the Opposition are quite happy to accommodate the inclusion of this clause 9. I would refer to part of the Minister's second reading explanation, and I quote it in total:

Furthermore, the community centre occupies some land on the northern side of Cowan Street. Vacant land to the south of Cowan Street is also under the board's care and control. However, this vacant land is not required by the board and it may be that other instrumentalities might have a use for the area. The Crown Solicitor has advised that the centre only has statutory power to dispose of land that is vested in it after the commencement of the principal Act. The amendment will therefore provide for the title of the land to be vested in the name of the centre and will revise the powers of disposal, subject to ministerial approval.

It was obviously an oversight, perhaps in drafting. I do not think it would have been intentional; it would have been a general belief that the powers given to the centre at its inception would have been able to accommodate the disposal of vacant land. However, in a technical and legal sense, it is not possible for it to proceed in the manner

which was originally written into the Act; hence the amendment which is forthcoming.

I am interested though to know what is the intention of the Government in relation to the disposable assets. It indicated very clearly that the Parks centre does not want the land because it is surplus to its needs. There is other land in close proximity to the present centre which will probably suit its desires better without the division of a fairly busy roadway. Therefore, what action has been taken is sound.

However, because it was an asset of the centre when created, is it the intention of the Government in this circumstance with the powers now vested in the community to dispose of the land along normal Government lines—that is, to offer it first of all to organisations directly associated with the Government and then to local government before putting it on the open market? Would the value of that land vest in the Parks Community Centre, and for what purpose will it be used? Will it be offset against other purchases, will it be available for capital works, or generally? It was an asset in the hands of the centre, so how is it intended that it be proceeded with?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am unable to give a clear explanation to the honourable member as to the use of those funds by the Government or by the Parks centre. They are important matters and I believe it is as well that he has raised them for the consideration of the Committee. I will undertake to raise the matter directly with the Minister of Local Government and, as soon as she is able to provide me with that information, I will make sure that the honourable member has it as early as possible. I repeat that they are interesting questions and I should know the answers. I wish I did, because to some extent they bear upon the ability of the Parks Community Centre to undertake future planning, programs, etc. It may be that these funds will be available to it or it may be that these funds will return to the Government. It is a very important question, and I will get the reply for the honourable member.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I accept that assurance given by the Minister. I just draw to the attention of the Committee under subclause (1b) that there will be no registration fee or stamp duty payable by the centre in respect of an application under proposed section (1a). This is a normal activity. It would be wrong, though, not to have drawn the attention of the Committee to its existence because it is a sum of money forgone so far as Government revenue is concerned. In the interests of Government service, I am happy to accept that, having registered its presence.

Clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 October. Page 1675.)

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): The Opposition supports the amendment before the House. For some time, in fact, I have been calling for amendments to the Public Works Standing Committee Act. It is quite obvious, when we look at some of the fiascos that have occurred recently (and the highlight of that is the Aquatic Centre at North Adelaide), that urgent amendments to the Act needed to be introduced as soon as possible. When I was Minister of Public Works in fact such amendments were drafted. They were not introduced because time did not allow it, but even

then I had prepared amendments, which were on file and ready to be introduced, highlighting a number of changes.

Some of those changes included lifting the statutory financial limit for work that needed to be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee. There had been no adjustment to that for some time to take account of inflation. Secondly, it included the fittings and furnishings, etc., in both the cost estimate for the building and for what had to be considered by the committee. Thirdly, it allowed the listing in the Appropriation Bills of projects which had not yet been approved by the Public Works Standing Committee—and I will comment on that in more detail shortly. Fourthly, it widened the powers of the Public Works Standing Committee to do a number of things.

They are the amendments that I had prepared, as Minister of Public Works, as I said. Unfortunately, time did not allow us to get those amendments into the House. They had been discussed by Cabinet and were in the final stage of preparation. I do not think that Cabinet had agreed to the exact final wording, but it had given instructions for the preparation. They had been prepared and Cabinet had asked for minor adjustments before being introduced into Parliament.

They were not formally introduced into Parliament. For the past three years I have pressed this Government and the Minister to ensure that those amendments were introduced as soon as possible. It disappoints me that it has taken three years—in fact, one day more than that—for them to be introduced. That reflects on the priorities of this Government in not giving top priority to public scrutiny and accountability in this area.

Yesterday, I gave a speech to the Institute of Architects in which I highlighted the lack of public accountability for large construction jobs carried out by the Government. I stressed the need for that accountability to be improved so that we did not end up with fiascos like the North Adelaide Aquatic Centre and the Frozen Food Factory. I will dwell for a moment on those two cases, because they highlight the inadequacies of the present Act.

Both those projects have been before the Public Works Standing Committee and both have been approved. First, the Frozen Food Factory had a cost escalation of something like twice or three times the original estimate. It was approved by the committee on the basis that it would produce 10 000 meals a day. By the time the factory was finished it was producing 20 000 meals a day—double the capacity originally approved by the committee. As it turned out, that was twice the capacity of all the public hospital beds in South Australia to consume the food.

Although there is enormous speculation that an election is to be called tomorrow, and although I realise that all members of the Government, except for the Minister responsible for this Bill, are obviously frantically out there now trying to win a vote or two and patch up their position because they are facing defeat—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! This has nothing to do with the Bill.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It has everything to do with the state of the House. Sir, I draw your attention to its poor state.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. There seems to be an excited backbench on the other side. I realise that there is an election atmosphere around, but one member seems to be particularly excited. I point out that it has taken three years.

I referred to the Frozen Food Factory and the fact that its completed cost was three times the original estimate and that it produced twice as many meals as were required. Here was a factory turning out 20 000 meals when there was a

demand for less than 10 000 meals, if supplied to all public hospitals in this State. That occurred because of lack of public accountability and it happened before the Liberal Party was elected.

As Minister of Public Works, I tried to find out who was responsible for making those decisions, but of course I could not do so. Some people in the Health Commission blamed people in the Public Buildings Department (as it was then) and people in the Public Buildings Department said that they received the directive from the Health Commission.

This highlights the enormous problems in working out exactly what the client department wanted and defining it on paper. We needed to ensure that nobody had any authority to change that without the Public Works Standing Committee or the Minister of Public Works knowing about it. It appears to me that on numerous occasions client departments have changed their minds halfway through planning for a project simply because they might have a new director or personnel within the department, or a new Minister.

Having changed their minds and issued new instructions to the construction authority, namely, the Public Buildings Department, no-one seems to have to pick up the ultimate responsibility and accountability for that change of direction. I highlight that as Minister of Public Works I gave much thought as to how to overcome that problem. My solution was to make sure that a project team was responsible for every major project and that there was a very senior person from the then Public Buildings Department responsible as Chairman of that project team. He was to take his orders from one person only—the Minister of Public Works.

It was interesting to see that for the Sir Samuel Way law courts building it worked extremely well, with Ray Powell as Chairman of that project team. No-one could issue instructions to him. The Chief Justice could not even lay down different instructions to the Chairman or the project team without my approval; nor could the Attorney-General or even the Premier. In that way, although it was a very difficult circumstance in which to construct a building in which judges, law courts, the Attorney-General and, of course, the Treasurer and superannuation fund were involved, and despite all those parties having a vested interest in it, we constructed a building that turned out according to budget, according to schedule for the works and according to the original specifications.

If flexibility and changes were needed we achieved them through the Minister of Public Works, but through no-one else. The same principle applied to the Metropolitan Fire Services Building in Wakefield Street—another large building costing something like \$14 million or \$15 million—for which we also established the same procedure. In that case, two unions with different opinions were involved. We had the Metropolitan Fire Services Board and other outside experts who put up counter evidence, but we resolved all those differences in that one project team which was chaired by Mr Chris Wevill, who did an excellent job in bringing the project to finality under budget and on time. I urge the Minister of Public Works—although I do not think he has long to serve in that portfolio—and future Ministers of Public Works to adopt that procedure when dealing with large projects.

An honourable member: Are you talking to yourself?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: As one of my colleagues has said, I am giving some advice to myself as future Minister of Public Works!

The Liberal Party has no argument with the Bill as presented to the House. It does four major things. First, it allows an increase in the statutory limit from \$500 000 to \$2 million. Secondly, it includes fittings and furnishings in the cost of a building for consideration by the Public Works

Standing Committee. Thirdly, it provides that such works are to be listed in the Appropriation Bills before the project has been approved by the Public Works Standing Committee. Fourthly, it allows the Public Works Standing Committee to review ongoing recurrent costs associated with proposed buildings.

As I said a moment ago, the Liberal Party has no argument with those proposals; in fact, they are all proposals that I have talked about on numerous occasions and we welcome them in this legislation. My concern is that the legislation does not go far enough.

I would like to highlight at least two areas where I believe the legislation should go further. I give an undertaking that a future Liberal Government (in fact the next Government of South Australia—a Liberal Government) will ensure that this legislation is again amended to take it further. It would appear that there is little chance of this legislation going through if this is the last day of Parliament sitting—and that is certainly what the media outside seem to be speculating at the moment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I am just repeating what I have been told outside. The Minister is sitting next to the Premier—perhaps he could give him a tap on the shoulder and ask him.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I wish the honourable member would link up his remarks to the Bill. In fact, the Chair would be very interested to see that the honourable member does link them up with the Bill.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: There are several areas in which further amendments need to be introduced. The first is that statutory authorities must be included. I am not referring to all statutory authorities, because I do not believe it is feasible to include some bodies such as the Electricity Trust, but at least some statutory authorities should be included.

I highlight to the House the extent to which at present it is so easy to get around the Public Works Standing Committee. All one would need to do is fund it by an outside body and then have a lease back arrangement by the State Government. The outside body could be a statutory authority. The sort of projects that did not go to the Public Works Standing Committee were the Law Courts Building and the Metropolitan Fire Service Building.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Wakefield House.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: As the Minister said, Wakefield House came into this category because that was bought as an off the shelf project. Therefore, the legislation that we have before us is deficient in the coverage that it currently has, especially as there has been a significant change in the manner in which the Government finances its construction projects such as buildings.

Over the past six years there has been no basic change in the capital allocated for Government buildings under the Public Buildings Department, or now the Department of Housing and Construction, in actual dollar terms. It has been kept very much the same: in other words, it has depreciated very significantly. But, what we have instead is Government buildings being financed by other means, namely, through the State Superannuation Fund, by other banking institutions, or by statutory authorities raising the money outside as loans perhaps through private lenders and then constructing the building, with the Government picking up the recurrent costs for the repayment of those loans. In those circumstances the Public Works Standing Committee has no jurisdiction whatsoever.

The second area where I believe that there are serious deficiencies is that, even with the latest amendments, the Act does not allow the Public Works Standing Committee

to review a project once construction has been started and to report back to Parliament on that project. I take the Aquatic Centre, for example. It was clear and obvious that after the original report of the Public Works Standing Committee circumstances had changed: costs had escalated, and a further investigation by the Public Works Standing Committee should have taken place as a matter of urgency. That did not and could not occur under the legislation, so we find that 18 months to two years later costs have escalated from \$3.5 million as the first estimate to something like \$8.2 million. Further problems have occurred, including structural problems and possibly problems with the consulting engineers. However, the committee was quite powerless to investigate those matters and report back to Parliament.

I would also argue that the whole nature of the investigation by the Public Works Standing Committee needs to change. My argument is that it needs to give far more attention to the overall needs of the facility being provided within that capital asset rather than paying too much attention to the technicalities of how the actual facility will be built. In other words, I think more emphasis needs to be given to whether or not Government even needs the building or capital facility, rather than the committee's turning its attention to the specific details of how it should be constructed.

The second area is a matter for the technical people. They certainly should be able to report, and I am pleased to say that particularly Keith Russack as Chairman and the members of the committee when we were in Government reported regularly to me on such matters as standards that applied with Government accommodation in Government buildings, and how those standards should have been modified to reduce the cost of construction. I know that the Public Buildings Department in those days greatly appreciated (and I am sure that the department greatly appreciates today) the guidance that was given by the committee on how to reduce the standards without reducing the function of the Government's building as it was constructed.

I am indicating clearly that the Liberal Party supports the Bill as far as it goes, but it says that it does not go far enough to ensure full and proper accountability of the Government's capital construction program. I do not intend to amend the legislation on what appears to be the last day of Parliament, especially as any amendments would require a great deal of careful drafting. This Bill was introduced into the Parliament only last week. Amendments covering some statutory authorities and not others and to give the committee full power to go back and review a project once construction has started and to report back to Parliament cannot be prepared in a hurry, which is what would have to happen. I simply indicate that I believe further amendments need to be prepared and that the powers of the committee need to be widened. I believe that the committee members now have, and indeed previously have had, the best of intentions, but they have not been able to exercise the powers that they would have liked to exercise to ensure full accountability to this Parliament.

I pay credit to the present members and Chairman, as well as to the previous members and Chairman, for what I think has been a difficult task that they have had to perform under an Act which has been inappropriate and has not given them the powers that they have really needed. I believe that if they had had different powers under the legislation the function and the role of that committee would automatically have changed and the benefit for the Parliament would have been substantial.

I would like to express one concern in relation to this Bill. I say that we support it, but my concern is that we are giving the power to Government by way of proclamation

to lift the \$2 million limit without necessarily taking account of inflation or referring the matter to Parliament. I have some concerns about that, and I would appreciate a comment perhaps from the present Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee. I know that some of his members have some concern about the way in which the amendment has been drafted. I do not say that there is opposition to lifting the amount to \$2 million as proposed, but there is some question whether a proclamation from the Government or from the Governor in Executive Council is the most appropriate means of increasing it in the future.

Mr Whitten: That's what it does.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I know that it lifts it to \$2 million, but it allows it to be increased further by proclamation.

Mr Whitten: Yes, but on the inflation rate each year.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Well, I will certainly see whether that is in fact the case. At least I express some caution about that area. The Opposition certainly supports the Bill, but indicates that after this election when we are in government we will certainly take the matter further.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Public Works): I thank the member for Davenport for his contribution. After becoming Minister of Works, I studied the Public Works Standing Committee Act and went through the dockets. It was obvious to me that the honourable member tried to change the Act when he was Minister. Although I do not say that I agreed with all his ideas for change, it seemed that he had tried to bring the Bill up-to-date as regards modern language, and I congratulate him on that.

I fail to see why the honourable member insisted on the figure of \$500 000. Perhaps one day in private conversation he will explain why he did not index that figure to cover inflation. The honourable member referred to two areas where he said that the existing legislation was unworkable, and mentioned circumstances in which cost escalations could take place. In this regard, he referred to the frozen food factory and the aquatic centre. I had nothing to do with the frozen food factory because at that time I was not even a member of Parliament.

Although some of the points made by the honourable member concerning the aquatic centre were valid, it seemed to escape him that the centre was originally costed on the basis of estimates submitted by a firm of consultants. Those figures were given to the Public Works Committee and, in all good faith, the committee proceeded to recommend to Parliament that the project should proceed. The cost escalation was not revealed until the project went to tender. When the tenders came in, it was obvious that the cost escalation was not due to the ineptness of the Government of the day, of the then Public Buildings Department, or of the Public Works Committee; the building costs and some design costs were so wrong as a result of the figures submitted by the firm of consultants that in no way could the Government of the day meet the total figure which, speaking from memory, was about \$3.5 million.

I recount those facts to lay to rest finally the Opposition's continued attacks regarding the cost of the aquatic centre. Today, one has only to visit the parklands at North Adelaide to see the centre and listen to the glowing praise not only from visitors from this State but also from visitors from other States who return home with an idea of the design so that a similar centre can be built in their State.

Changes to the legislation were proposed by the member for Elizabeth but, because of an unfortunate situation for which I, as the responsible Minister, must take some responsibility, my advisers were not available to the honourable member to help him place his suggested amendments before

me. Now there is not complete agreement between the Government and the member for Elizabeth on his amendments and as the responsible Minister I apologise to him. I appreciate that his intentions in drawing up his amendments were beyond reproach and I give my word that some of the points raised by the honourable member will be considered at the earliest possible convenience in the new Parliament whether this Party or another Party is in government.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Public Works): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Duty to submit proposals for new public works to committee.'

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: As I said on second reading, I find the Bill acceptable with the reservation that I believe that it should have gone further and I thought that amendments were to be moved to that end. During my speech the Chairman of the Public Works Committee interjected to say that, although in new subsection (1b) the Governor is empowered to proclaim an increase in the declared amount of \$2 million, protection is provided by the requirement that any such increase shall be in line with inflation. However, although that statement is contained in the Minister's second reading explanation, the Bill contains no such protection and that is most unfortunate because I believe that, as the Bill stands now, a future Government could increase the declared amount by a figure greater than that which was in line with inflation.

As I have not had time to draft an amendment to give effect to my desires in this respect, I will have drafted an amendment that can be moved in the Upper House to correct the position. I thought that amendments were to be moved today, but apparently they are not to be moved. Although I am happy with the provision in new subsection (1b) concerning the proclamation, I believe that such proclamation should ensure that any increase in the declared amount is in line with inflation, otherwise a Minister could have the declared amount increased to \$50 million without coming to Parliament for approval.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I support the views expressed by the member for Davenport. The Government's intention in the clause is that it is to be done by proclamation and the declared amount allows for inflationary changes. This is probably one area where the member for Davenport and I differ. The member for Davenport's proposed amendment leaves the declared amount at \$500 000. It is the Government's view that by doing it by proclamation it would only take into account any increases due to inflation. The amount of \$500 000 was set in 1974, while the Bill proposes an amount of \$2 million. The rate of inflation indexed in relation to building costs and so on gives a figure very close to \$2 million. I take the member for Davenport's point: a future Government could raise the amount by proclamation to an amount way beyond the inflation rate. If an amendment is moved in another place (and I think I will ensure that one is moved by the Government), we will take that into account. I am sure that will satisfy the member for Davenport.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 and 7) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOUNT LOFTY BOTANIC GARDEN

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.J. Hopgood:

That this House resolve to recommend to His Excellency the Governor that, pursuant to sections 13 and 14 of the Botanic Gardens Act 1978, part section 529, hundred of Onkaparinga, be disposed of, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 10 September. Page 773.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): The Opposition supports the motion. I regret that the Minister for Environment and Planning is not present to answer some of my specific questions. I have had the opportunity of speaking to people closely associated with the botanic gardens. They have indicated their support for this move. Of course, part section 529—part of the Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens—is a small parcel of land. I think that most of the Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens is in my new District of Heysen.

Mrs Appleby: You should know by now.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It will come into my new District of Heysen.

Mrs Appleby: That is better.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The member should not become too excited.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have had a long association with the Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens. As Minister I gave very strong support to the Botanic Gardens Board, which had a strong desire to build up these gardens, which are a credit to those involved. The gardens form a magnificent tourist attraction and a magnificent facility which is quite splendid at this time of the year with the colour of the flowering shrubs. We appreciate that the gardens were devastated during the Ash Wednesday bushfire; they suffered considerable damage. I have asked the Minister a number of questions since that time to determine how much support the Government would give the board to enable it to get the gardens back into working order and open to the public. I regret that more financial support has not been provided.

I think that the sheer determination of the board and the magnificent work by those employed in this area have allowed the gardens to be open to the thousands of tourists who go to view them and to those who enjoy, as I do, walking through them. In fact, only a few weeks ago I visited the gardens with my family. I strongly recommend the gardens to those members who have not had an opportunity to visit them. I would have liked to be assured that the money that will come as a result of the sale of this land will go back to the Botanic Gardens Board. I know that this question has been asked by those associated with the board.

The board is doing a magnificent job with the gardens under its responsibility, but it could do with more financial assistance. I hope that the money that goes to the board from this sale will assist the board in the future. I understand that the land was originally purchased as a result of a grant to the botanic gardens. That is all the more reason why the funding should go back to the botanic gardens. With those few words I support the motion. Any questions that I have for the Minister on this matter can wait until a time when the Minister for Environment and Planning is in the Chamber.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands): I thank the member for Murray for supporting the motion. I apologise that the Minister for Environment and Planning cannot be present today. I am sure that, if the member would like to ask any questions, my colleague will be only too

happy to respond to them. No doubt the member is familiar with this area. It may well be that the Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens will be in his new district after the next election as a result of the boundary changes. The Botanic Gardens Board considers that long-term savings in relation to the maintenance of the house can be achieved from its disposal, and that revenue from the sale should be put back into further development of the Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens for a public interpretive centre adjacent to the upper car park and the restoration of fire damage adjacent to Summit Road and upgrading of Crafers quarry. I am sure that, if any other areas can be assisted through the sale of the two sections of land and the house, that money will be used for that purpose. I thank the Opposition for supporting the motion and commend it to the House.

Motion carried.

PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

[Sitting suspended from 4.22 to 9.24 p.m.]

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYMENT BILL

At 9.25 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to Amendment No. 1:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to this amendment.

As to Amendments Nos 2 and 3:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on these amendments.

As to Amendment No. 4:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment but make in lieu thereof the following amendment:

Page 2, line 29 (clause 4)—After 'Minister' insert ', being another Minister, the Commissioner, or another Chief Executive Officer (or person having the powers and functions of a Chief Executive Officer) remunerated at a level at least equivalent to that of the Chief Executive Officer in question', and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendments Nos 5 and 6:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to these amendments.

As to Amendment No. 7:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment, but make in lieu thereof the following amendments:

Page 6—

line 14—leave out 'provision for the according of preference' and insert 'special provision'.

line 15—leave out 'to' and insert 'for'.

line 18—leave out 'to' and insert 'for'.

line 22—leave out 'the according of such preference in pursuance of such a program' and insert 'any such special provision'.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 8:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to this amendment.

As to Amendment No. 9:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment.

As to Amendment No. 10:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to this amendment.

As to Amendment No. 11:

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out proposed new clause 15a, and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 12:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment but make in lieu thereof the following amendments:

Clause 16, page 9—lines 9 to 12—leave out all words in these lines and insert:

review and—

(i) to establish appropriate general policies in relation to personnel management and industrial relations in the Public Service;

and

(ii) to advise the Minister responsible for the administration of this Act and other Ministers on policies, practices and procedures that should be applied to any other aspect of management in the Public Service or to any aspect of management in other parts of the public sector.

After line 35—insert new clause as follows:

16a. The Board may give such general directions to the Commissioner as it considers necessary for the proper implementation of any policy that it has established in relation to personnel management or industrial relations in the Public Service.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 13:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to this amendment.

As to Amendments Nos 14 and 15:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on these amendments.

As to Amendments Nos 16 to 18:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to these amendments.

As to Amendments Nos 19 and 20:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on these amendments.

As to Amendment No. 21:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment, but make in lieu thereof the following amendment:

Clause 27, page 14, lines 3 to 5—leave out paragraph (a) and insert paragraphs as follow:

(a) to ensure the implementation of the general policies in relation to personnel management and industrial relations established by the Board;

(ab) to establish and ensure the implementation of appropriate practices and procedures in relation to personnel management and industrial relations in the Public Service;

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendments Nos 22 and 23:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to these amendments.

As to Amendment No. 24:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment.

As to Amendment No. 25:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to this amendment.

As to Amendment No. 26:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment.

As to Amendments Nos 27 and 28:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to these amendments.

As to Amendment No. 29:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment.

As to Amendment No. 30:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to this amendment.

As to Amendment No. 31:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment.

As to Amendments Nos 32 and 33:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to these amendments.

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

There were 33 amendments that had to be considered by the conference. Of course, a number of those were consequential, so in fact the substantive matters to be dealt with were somewhat fewer in number than that, but there was a considerable number. Of those substantive matters, some were of a machinery nature and the conference found no great difficulty in dealing with them, but there were a number of matters of principle that occupied the conference for some time. I am pleased to advise the Committee that eventually we were able to agree on the recommendations before us.

I refer briefly to some of them. As to amendment No. 1, it is recommended that we do not further insist on disagreement. This amendment alters the long title of the Bill. While the House of Assembly took the view that the proposed amendment did not add to the Bill and, in fact, there were some problems with it, it was felt that no great violence was done to the purpose of the Bill by so amending the long title. Thus we recommend that the House do not insist on that amendment. Amendments Nos 2 and 3 related to a retitling of 'Commissioner for Public Employment' and, after consideration of a number of alternatives, the conference agreed that the word 'Commissioner' was appropriate in the circumstances. The Legislative Council will not insist on that amendment.

Amendment No. 4 concerned a more substantive matter in that the Legislative Council insisted on deleting the ministerial nominee in the case of disciplinary action involving a chief executive officer. The conference discussed this matter and resolved that, rather than delete the ability to have a nominee, a precise definition of the category from which that nominee could be drawn should be substituted. That is the amendment that appears before us. I believe that it improves the Bill and puts into effect the intention of the conference.

Amendment No. 5 relates to a definition of 'senior position' which was agreeable to the House of Assembly representatives, and we recommend that amendment. Amendment No. 6 concerned the inclusion of the Electricity Trust of South Australia in the definitions under clause 4. Although this was something that had been agreed among the parties prior to the Bill's being brought into the House, nonetheless it was felt that the Legislative Council's position in this matter could be acceded to, again without doing any great violence to the Bill, and so it was agreed.

Amendment No. 7 related to the very important matter of equal employment opportunity provisions. There was considerable disagreement between the Houses on this matter. It was the view of the House of Assembly managers that equal opportunity programs and what stemmed from them had to be maintained in the Bill. The Legislative Council managers in particular insisted that the specific reference to 'preference' should be modified and the eventual agreement between the managers of the conference is that we disagree with the Legislative Council amendment as proposed, leaving the equal opportunity program clauses substantially as they left this Committee. However, instead of the reference to 'preference' we will insert a reference to special provisions as part of that program. That was eventually agreed by the conference as being a reasonable position.

Amendment No. 8 covered the nomination by the United Trades and Labor Council of a member of the Management

Board. The Legislative Council's amendment would have that nominee drawn from someone who is, in fact, a member of the Public Service—a public employee. While the House of Assembly managers felt that this imposed some inflexibility on the Bill, nonetheless as part of the overall agreement we resolved not to further insist on our disagreement to that amendment.

Amendment No. 9 concerned the question of whether there should be a full-time or part-time Chairman. The Legislative Council managers insisted that the Management Board have a full-time Chairman with no option on this matter. The House of Assembly position was that the option must be preserved. Initially, it is the Government's stated intention that there be a part-time Chairman but, as we look at the working of the board and see how it develops, there will be a case for a full-time Chairman, but to include that as a requirement of the Bill would be far too restrictive. That position has been adopted by the conference and therefore the Legislative Council will not further insist on its amendment.

Amendment No. 10 is essentially a drafting point and was agreed to by the House of Assembly representatives at the conference. Amendment No. 11 has two parts, one relating to the disclosure of pecuniary interests by members of the board. In this area the position of the House of Assembly was that clause 15 (a) would be too restrictive in that it might discourage persons from outside the Public Service whose particular skills or talents could be useful to the Government Management Board from actually taking their place on that board. The point was made, of course, that if a possible conflict of interest arose there would be other provisions to deal with the declaration, but to impose a prior position regarding a pecuniary interest statement, even with a provision of confidentiality, would constitute too onerous a requirement on someone wishing to be a member of the board.

So, the Legislative Council consequently agreed to amend its amendment No. 11 by leaving out the proposed new clause 15a. As to clause 15b, the extent to which the board is subject to ministerial direction, the conference agreed to the Legislative Council's amendment as being acceptable. Amendment No. 12 was probably the matter of most substance and occupied most time at the conference. I am pleased to say that an appropriate consensus was reached on an amended form of that clause and the consequential clauses. It related to the role of the Government Management Board and the role of the Commissioner of Public Employment and how the two dovetailed in.

The Assembly managers were insisting that the purpose of the Bill was to ensure that the Government Management Board was not bogged down on day to day individual personnel, industrial and other problems but was, as the Act provides, concerned more with the broad policy issues. Equally, the Council managers said that there must be some clearer definition of the relationship between the Commissioner of Public Employment and the board. It does, of course, create the problem that to an extent the Commissioner of Public Employment is answerable to two masters, namely, the board in respect of certain functions and, of course, the Minister in charge of the aspects of the Act administered by the Commissioner of Public Employment.

The amendment that has finally come forward for adoption in lieu of the Legislative Council's amendment in the view of the conference successfully preserves that principle of the Bill to which I alluded earlier whilst at the same time clarifying satisfactorily the relationship between the Commissioner and the board. In the way it is worded it will make that clearer.

Amendment No. 13 was accepted as being not a matter of major principle. Amendment No. 14 was consequential

on the Commissioner/Director relationship to which I alluded earlier under clause 4. This and clause 15 were consequential on amendments Nos 2 and 3. Amendments Nos 16 to 18 were accepted by the House of Assembly managers in the conference. One substitutes a clause which provided that the Commissioner of Public Employment could only be removed by an address of both Houses for one which substitutes the power of the Governor in relation to certain specified categories under which removal may occur, namely, misconduct, neglect of duty, incompetence or mental or physical incapacity. That was found acceptable by the conference.

Amendments Nos 17 and 18 were consequential on that decision. Amendments Nos 19 and 20 are no longer insisted upon by the Legislative Council. That was in fact a key amendment because it had the effect of making the Commissioner responsible to two bodies and confused their role. The earlier redrafting to which I referred clarified that position and therefore made amendments Nos 19 and 20 no longer necessary. Amendment No. 21 was caught up under the question of the role of the Commissioner of Public Employment and again the relationship with the board is covered by the earlier amendment to which I have referred. It is consequential, but requires a redraft, appearing on the paper at page 3. Amendment No. 22 was simply a clarification of the drafting and the House of Assembly is prepared to agree to it.

Amendment No. 23 was consequential on amendment No. 19. Amendment No. 24 was also a consequential amendment. Amendment No. 25 was agreed to. This left out the word 'shall' and inserted the word 'may' in respect of certain action that the Minister would be required to take on receiving a report from the Commissioner of Public Employment. Amendment No. 26 is not insisted upon by the Legislative Council, which was prepared to accept the Assembly position in relation to the Director reporting on disagreements with the Minister. There is a discretion on whether those disagreements are reported or not. The discretion lies with the Commissioner of Public Employment in that instance.

Amendment No. 30 is consequential on amendment No. 29. Amendment No. 31 was consequential on the pecuniary interest provision to which I referred earlier and, in consequence of that amendment not being insisted upon by the Legislative Council, this in effect lapses as well. Finally, I refer to amendments Nos 32 and 33. Amendment No. 32 is consequential upon the inclusion of ETSA under amendment No. 6. In the case of amendment No. 33, to do with the doubling of a penalty under schedule 3 on page 50, the House of Assembly agreed not to further insist on its disagreement to those amendments.

In summary, one can see that there was a lot of give and take in the conference—a lot of Assembly amendments were agreed to, a number of Legislative Council amendments were agreed to, and, in some cases of principle, a compromise position was adopted by the conference. One could say that it is the ideal result in a deadlock. From the viewpoint of the Government, reverting to that role rather than as the Chairman of the conference of managers, I believe the Bill as it comes from the conference is in an acceptable form. Its basic principles and objects are preserved. It is an historic reform of Government public sector management and will lead to improvements in efficiency and public administration. I suspect that it is going to be looked at with great interest by other States also to see how it works out.

It is the result of very long consideration by committees and lots of consultation. The fact that the Bill as amended preserves the important principles laid down by those committees and the result of those consultations is very impor-

tant indeed. The Government certainly would not have been prepared to push on with the Bill if real violence had been done to the principles lying behind it. It has not and the amendments in some respects improve the Bill. In others, whilst we were not happy with them—for instance, with the position taken on the question of contracts in relation to the procedures of filling positions—amendments Nos 29 and 30 where the position of the Legislative Council was that both paragraph (a) and paragraph (c) should be completely deleted leaving very much an open slather position in terms of the rights for appointment of those already within the Public Service (a fairly fundamental attack on the career structure of it)—the fact that we were able to reach a compromise was very important indeed. The compromise was that, whilst we do not insist on paragraph (c) remaining in the Bill, we were able to secure the retention of paragraph (a). If we had not been able to do that, quite frankly it would have been very difficult indeed to agree to the Bill's passing. One could argue that in that instance it would have been better to stick with the *status quo*, however unsatisfactory.

But, the compromise reached around amendments Nos 29 and 30 in relation to contracts of appointment is a reasonable one which can work. I would still say that I am unhappy that we were forced to delete subclause (c) because it spelt out very clearly existing rights for those within the service. However, with one or two exceptions like that, I suggest that the Bill has emerged as a very workable document, a fitting tribute to those who have worked on it for so long, and a major reform to Government management and employment procedures. I commend the recommendations of the conference to the Committee.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Certainly I agree with the Premier that the Bill is in an acceptable form. I have not used the term 'totally acceptable' because he would appreciate that there are issues that he would have liked to have seen resolved slightly differently. It is quite conceivable that there are issues that we would have liked to have seen resolved slightly differently. However, the long period of time put in to this measure by members of both sides of this House, the consultation that has been undertaken and the length of time that has been used up today to look at the virtues of the various measures I think augurs well for the future, because it is a piece of legislation which has really been gone through with a fine-tooth comb. The work which was done on it in the formative stages is quite monumental, and the report which was brought down and which has been referred to previously indicated, to use the Premier's term, an innovative way to go.

Opposition members have been quite happy to join in that experience, and we have certainly been very happy to have offered the Parliament, both here and upstairs, a number of alternatives to the form in which the original Bill was presented. The fact that the Government, even before we got to the conference of managers today, was prepared to accept a number of alternatives that were put forward by the Opposition in this House and subsequently in another place is an indication of the bipartisanship that has been shown in the formulation of the final product.

It would be unwise to believe that we have necessarily crossed every 't' and dotted every 'i' in a piece of legislation of this nature. It will be interesting to see how the transition phase takes over from the existing management of the Public Service. I suggest that there is a definite will by both Parties to see the matter implemented not quickly but effectively and in as short a time as possible so as to gain the benefits of the new directions which are outlined. I would like to believe that, in the implementation, there will be consultation between the two sides of this House. Albeit the positions may be different, but administrative actions

will need to be undertaken and considered so that we can effectively see an end result.

I do not want to deal with all the clauses that the Premier has moved through, but I think it is important that some comment be made on a number of them. The Opposition was very clear in its mind in the early stages that in a Bill which was to provide a better service for the public or in which the service to the public was paramount—and that was certainly highlighted in the original report—then the long title of the Bill should give some consideration to that fact. The insistence by the Upper House and the final agreement of the two Houses that the long title of the Bill will be altered may not spell out in total all the facets of the Bill, but it certainly does pick up that important part of the delivery of service.

In relation to the name of the person who is to be the head of the new branch, the Hon. Mr Milne in another place had selected the name 'Director' and suggested, for example, that there be some 238 alterations to the Bill to change the name from 'Commissioner' to 'Director'. It was right that he should have picked up a point and been prepared to run with it. However, I believe that the information given to the committee by the Premier was well taken: that to have maintained the name 'Director' when that Director in turn would have been directly responsible for and over Directors-General, Directors and others was to create a potential confusion which would not have helped in the final end product.

Other names were considered—one or two of them from foreign countries—but 'Commissioner' was the term with which we finally agreed. If somebody had been able to determine another name that was equally representative or definitive, no doubt consideration would have been given to that. But, we are quite happy to know that there is a Commissioner, and it goes hand in glove with the fact that there were previously Commissioners of the Public Service Board.

Amendment No. 4, where the Minister's nominee has been more clearly defined, may by some people be thought cumbersome, but I believe that every word there is necessary. I very clearly point out that it will not be the office boy which is sent to rap the knuckles of somebody who has created a mischief. If it is not the Minister or another Minister, it will be a Chief Executive Officer or someone of at least the same remuneration level as the person who is to be counselled. I use the word 'counselled' in its widest sense. It may be more deliberate when the meeting is held.

In relation to ETSA, it was stated very clearly in this House when the matter was debated that a number of professional people in that area were very concerned about the action that was being taken. Members of the committee were sufficiently determined in their mind that ETSA was something different to many other areas of the Public Service. I point out that this aspect of the Bill, like a number of the others, is not necessarily set in cement. We believe that this is the best way to go and if, through experience, it becomes necessary to rethink the various clauses at a later stage, this being one of them, that action will be taken. Suffice to say that at the present moment we are quite happy to see that ETSA is given the same treatment as two other major organisations of a semi-governmental nature.

In relation to the senior position, in amendment No. 5, here again we have a term of words that was canvassed in this House earlier. In fact, it goes further than the words that were used in this House when we were considering a senior officer being a person of EO3 or equivalent. The Government has accepted a move from another place to alter that to the equivalent of an EO1. The Opposition is not unfavourable towards that. We believe that those within the service are quite happy about that. Again, experience

will tell whether that goes too far down the scale or whether in fact the alteration should be made upwards at a later stage.

I am not suggesting by my comments in relation to ETSA or to the senior position that we would want to see the legislation back in the House every second week. That is not meant to be the case, but there needs to be a review after a reasonable period of how effectively these new measures are affecting the work of the Public Service and, if adjustment is necessary, so be it.

I would like very quickly to refer to amendment No. 9 which relates to the chairmanship of the board. I agree with the Premier, as did the committee generally, that there was a distinct benefit in having an element of flexibility. This is an area in which it may well be determined that a chairman should be full time. We would not envisage it in that way. We saw that it was far better that the chairman be brought in with particular expertise and be available on a part-time basis. The flexibility is maintained by the Legislative Council's not insisting on the amendment which has been put forward, but, in relation to this matter of chairmanship and the general area of the size of the board, we did not persist with the arrangement of altering the nature of the board as had been intended in the discussions which took place in this House earlier. Again, this is a matter of waiting to see how the whole procedure works. I think it will be satisfactory. However, there are alternatives if at a later stage it is deemed necessary.

In relation to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 11, there is an amendment by moving out the new clause 15a which relates to pecuniary interest. This very nearly stayed in. I say that because there were pros and cons on both sides of the argument on whether a reference to pecuniary interest should be placed in the Bill in this spot. It was suggested that it might deny the opportunity to a number of people in the commercial world who want to come in and give the type of service that the State would be asking of them if they had to put their name to a pecuniary interest document.

I believe that it has become a fact of life. Whilst I do not totally hold with the concept, and never did when it was brought in for members of Parliament (and I certainly did not in relation to local government), now that it has become a fact of life it is a measure that ought to be there for everybody who is working within the system. Certainly it applies in other areas of this Bill. However, for the moment, the pecuniary interest clause is relative to persons who will be members of the board, other than of course the Commissioner, who will be a member of the board and is caught by another clause, does not apply.

However, there was the move to accept clause 15b, which related to the extent to which the board was subject to ministerial direction. We wanted to take the politicisation of the Public Service out of the measure as much as possible. I believe that this inclusion, which gives parameters within which action can be taken, was most necessary for the end result. I commend members of the Committee for thinking that way and for accepting that measure.

I refer to amendment No. 12, which alters clause 16. On reading clause 16 I subsequently referred to clause 27 of the Bill, in which there is a realignment of responsibilities of the board and the relationship with the Commissioner. There is a much closer and, I believe, fundamentally important change in these two areas which will lead to a close relationship, but not too close a relationship, between members of the board and the Commissioner. It parallels to some degree the managing director situation with a board in the public sector (the managing director of course being the Commissioner): the members of the board being responsible for determining policy and not getting themselves into

the day-by-day activities of the whole organisation, other than as that might apply or translate into policy.

I now mention reporting. As to amendment No. 26, it was agreed that the Legislative Council do not further insist on the amendment. The original amendment No. 26 was to leave out 'may be referred to in the annual report of the Commissioner' and insert 'shall be referred to in the director's annual report if it has not been sooner referred to by the director in a special report under section 33'.

A considerable amount of concern was expressed about the deletion of this amendment by the Upper House. It was one which could again easily have gone either way, but it was declined in the final analysis. However, I should say that it is a feature of the overall working of the whole Act and the relationship of the Commissioner and the various chief executive officers and the board, which I believe will come under scrutiny at the review which I believe is essential for the new Act within 12 to 18 months.

I am not suggesting that there be major alterations or necessarily any alterations after 12 to 18 months, but after a shakedown period, or a period of settling in, some aspects of the measures will need to be measured against experience. There may well be a need to reconsider the inclusion of a reporting section in relation to clause 29. It could be embarrassing and that was probably the reason why it was left out: it might open up old wounds or be quite superfluous to have it. Anyone functioning in a proper way in the top senior position will have undertaken the necessary reporting or made it quite obvious as to what action had been taken. Rather than cause a hitch at this stage it, was deferred. However, I want to place on record that this is an area at which my colleagues will look in a subsequent review period.

My final comment relates to amendment No. 31 from the Legislative Council which had been titled 'new clause 80a' and which related to the confidentiality of information as to pecuniary interests as disclosed under the Act. It has been removed from this schedule or from the Committee's consideration because it is consequential on others.

However, again I point out that it may well be a matter that should come back for consideration later if it can be demonstrated at any stage that there has been a conflict of interest or a lack of knowledge of the pecuniary interests of somebody who is acting on the board and that there is a question of probity in relation to the action that that person has taken and the conduct of the board's activities. It is not a threat: it is just picking up the reality that it is an area which is now par for the course and may yet have to be returned.

I thank the Premier for his conduct of the conference today. There was an air of reality from members on both sides of politics and from the two Houses in finally coming to the agreement which is now reported. I look forward to a successful commencement of the functions of the Act and place on record my keen interest in reports—interim or annual—from the Commissioner and the board, because I believe that this is one of the major areas of concern to the parliamentary system which directly interfaces with its front door officers—those who work within the Public Service. I do not want to downgrade them by saying that they are at the front door or the front shop.

Members and others will know precisely what I mean: we are looking to put into place an Act which will allow the Public Service not only to continue the great record that it has in this State but also to improve it wherever possible by giving officers greater opportunity and also by capitalising on the experience which may be brought into the Public Service from time to time on a short-term or long-term basis involving people who have demonstrated expertise in the wider world. I commend the recommendations to the Committee.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I will keep my remarks very brief indeed, but at the outset I want to express my deep regret that events of an urgent nature prevented me from taking my place on the conference. I want to take this opportunity of congratulating the managers of both Houses on reaching a result which I think has brought about a better Act of Parliament than otherwise would have been the case. I want to confine my remarks to four matters. First, I am very pleased that the conference was able to decide that, following acceptance by this Chamber and by another place, the definition of 'senior position' (Executive Officer 1 or equivalent and above) would be incorporated in the Bill.

When the Bill was first before the House the Opposition wanted to ascertain the Government's intention as to what grade of public servant it believed should be incorporated within the definition of 'senior position'. At that time the Premier was unable to give us an answer, but coming from the conference it is obvious it was a position of about this grade and above. I am very pleased that, we are now able to have without loss of flexibility I believe, that position defined in the Bill. I think it will be very valuable to those in the Public Service, public service unions, and the like, who have expressed concern to us as to what was meant exactly by 'senior position', because they will now know what it is.

Secondly, I am very pleased with the result on the question of power of direction. This was a linchpin clause, if I can put it that way, as far as the Opposition was concerned. The Opposition was concerned that the then Commissioner of the Public Service was to have such unfettered powers. We believed that it was necessary that there should be some control over that position. It may well have been (and obviously the conference thought so) that the Opposition's original amendments in this place went too far, but what has emerged from the conference is a power of general direction over the office of the Commissioner as it applies to the establishment of appropriate general policies on personnel management and industrial relations. That is very significant.

I support the remarks made by the Premier in this regard. That means that the Commissioner has the power and a decision-making right over the lesser Public Service administrative requirements as far as these areas are concerned, but in areas of general policy the board will have the power of direction. I think that is an improvement and, once again, I congratulate the conference on that result. As I say, it was a linchpin as far as the Opposition was concerned. We are very pleased with the result.

As to the question of the contract (and the Premier mentioned this matter), I want to make it quite plain that the Opposition, with its amendments in this House, was not on an exercise of Public Service bashing. The Premier has made it very plain in his remarks, both in this place when the Bill was originally considered and just recently, that flexibility was a paramount requirement and was indeed necessary. That is really what the Opposition's amendments were designed to achieve in the case of negotiable positions—or the appointment of people to fill negotiable positions—and contracts. I believe that this is a compromise—or, as the Premier likes to put it, a consensus—that is acceptable to all. It gives more flexibility than was otherwise contained in the original legislation, and I do not believe that anyone should have to fear the amendment as it has emerged from the conference. I repeat that under no circumstances was the Opposition involved in an exercise of union bashing.

Finally, I am extremely pleased to see that the service to the public has been recognised in the legislation. That is really what it is all about and really what the report of the

Guerin committee was about. I strongly believe that the legislation that will now pass through this Parliament is a more accurate reflection of the recommendations of the Guerin committee than was the original legislation. I believe that that is to the credit of the deadlock provisions of this Parliament which have come under attack from time to time because of the quaint nature of the rules that govern them. They particularly came under attack from the now Justice Millhouse when he was the former member for Mitcham. I believe that this exercise, if nothing else, has proven the value of the deadlock provisions of this Parliament, and I repeat that the legislation that we will now have is a far more accurate reflection of the recommendations of that very excellent Guerin committee report.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: I advise the member for Mallee that we are dealing with the Management Committee and not the Milk Bill.

Mr LEWIS: May I therefore seek your indulgence to restate that direction? I am deaf and I did not hear what your advice was. The amplification was not very good.

The CHAIRMAN: Just proceed.

Mr LEWIS: Obviously it was in good humour and I have taken it as such, although I did not hear the comment or understand it. Notwithstanding the remarks that have been made by the Premier, the member for Light and the member for Torrens, and not wishing to detract from the value of their support expressed albeit in euphoric terms for the consequence which we now have before us in the form of a compromise from the conference of managers on this measure, I still have grave reservations. I am concerned not only about the effect of the agreements arrived at by the conference of managers but also about the way, it seems to me, that one may interpret the measure according to one's inclination.

I agree with the point made by all previous speakers that the measure now more than ever before ensures that the Public Service understands that it is there to be a service to the public. I am still concerned about the direction in which the Public Service can be taken by political elements. Given that there are 33 amendments and that I have had little more than as many minutes to consider the implications of those amendments, I note that I am the only person, apart from those who participated as members of the conference, attempting to express concern in this area. I am doing this on the eve of the dissolution of Parliament, the swan song of a Labor Government sitting asleep on the Government benches.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I am concerned that this may have far reaching implications. It enables the Public Service of South Australia to be easily grafted into the Public Service of the Commonwealth where Sir Humphrey takes control and enables that transition to occur without so much as a whimper being possible from me, or any other member of Parliament, in the process.

I am sure that could and would happen under an Administration whose philosophical views were different from mine and those of the Party to which I belong. That has always worried me in relation to this measure: I said so in my second reading speech, and to illustrate that point I refer particularly to amendment No. 12 in relation to clause 16 and amendment No. 25 relating to clause 29. I think it hardly fair to expect people who are supposed to represent the interests of the public (who elect members in their respective electorates) to be able to digest the implications of something as complex as this in 30 minutes, and then to sit down, shut up and accept it without saying anything. I think that is quite unreasonable.

All three speakers who preceded me indicated that the measure represented a substantial change in the way in which the Public Service will be both directed and administered. In general terms it may be a good blueprint for other States of the nation to consider, but given the reservations expressed by the member for Light and, albeit softly, the member for Torrens, I indicate that I am also concerned about those aspects of administration which may in the immediate future require amendment.

For instance, I simply do not understand the proposed amendment to clause 29. We find that the word 'may', an innocuous little three-letter word, is to be substituted by the word 'shall'. I wonder how many members here know what that means. With 'shall', the provision means that the matter must be referred to in the Director's annual report, if not referred to sooner by the Director in a special report (under section 33). I challenge any member here, without my having explained it, to tell me what that amendment refers to. I am quite sure that anyone who had not participated in the conference would understand that. I am genuinely concerned about that aspect—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair has been pretty lenient with the honourable member. The Committee is not here to debate the Bill but to deal with the recommendations of the conference, so I do not think that the honourable member should start to embark on a debate, or to bait members of the Government to indulge in a debate, similar to one on the second reading. I ask the honourable member to deal with the results of the conference and nothing else.

Mr LEWIS: In what instance was it that I failed to do that? I was drawing the attention of the Committee to amendment No. 26 dealing with clause 29. If I was mistaken in my attempts to draw the Committee's attention to that matter, what is it that I may refer to?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair will not indulge in a discussion with the honourable member on a question of procedure or what will occur after the honourable member finishes his speech. The Committee is currently dealing only with the results of the conference. We are not dealing with a matter that may have arisen during the course of the second reading debate.

Mr LEWIS: In this context I did not refer to the second reading debate. My remarks were relevant to amendment No. 26, relating to clause 29. I was discussing the implications of the substitution of 'shall, for 'may'. I do not understand how it was that I contravened Standing Orders by drawing the attention of members to that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair will not allow the member for Mallee to continue in that vein. I have tried as best I can to point out to the honourable member that we are dealing with the recommendations of the conference, and that that is all we are dealing with. The Chair will not answer the honourable member in any other way.

Mr LEWIS: In order for me to understand what it is that I may speak about, can you please explain to me how I transgressed that general direction when I drew attention to amendment No. 26, relative to clause 29 and lines 28 and 29 of page 16 of the Bill, in relation to which we have been informed that the passage 'may be referred to in the annual report of the Director' is to be amended to read 'shall be referred to in the annual report of the Director'? I thought that I was addressing myself explicitly to the recommendations of the conference of managers and to what I understood to be the consequences of the passing of this measure in the recommended form. Can you tell me how I transgressed from Standing Orders by doing that?

The CHAIRMAN: I will explain to the honourable member for the last time how he is transgressing Standing Orders. I pulled up the honourable member simply because he was debating the merits of what happened in the conference.

That matter is not before the Chair: the question before the Committee concerns the decisions and recommendations agreed to by the conference. I hope that I have explained that clearly to the honourable member because, if he proceeds in the way that he is proceeding at present, the Chair will simply rule him out of order.

Mr LEWIS: To me that is tantamount to telling me to sit down and shut up. Accordingly, I accept that as your direction. I can see no other way to address this measure. If I am not allowed to refer to specific words contained in the recommendation of the report from the conference of managers and attempt to explain my understanding of their consequence in relation to the legislation, then I see you, Sir, as being guilty of a gross miscarriage of justice in this place.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I assure the member for Mallee, if it is the last thing I do as Chairman in this Committee, that if he proceeds in that vein I will name him. I am quite serious.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Chairman, so am I. I want to discuss the implications of leaving out the words 'may be referred to in the annual report of the Commissioner' and inserting the words 'shall be referred to in the Director's annual report if it has not been sooner referred to by the Director in a special report under section 33'.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the honourable member does not get on and deal with the recommendations of the conference, the Chair will rule him out of order.

Mr LEWIS: I am dealing with the recommendations as provided to me, as a member of this place, in a document entitled '51 (1) Government Management Employment Bill 1985—Schedule of Amendments made by the Legislative Council as they relate specifically to the Government Management Employment Bill 1985, recommendations of conference'. If I am not allowed to speak to that, I say to you, Mr Chairman, a pox on your decisions and on this Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not accept that and I rule the honourable member completely out of order. I put to the Committee that the question before the Chair is that the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Chairman, I have not yet exhausted my options to speak, as I understand Standing Orders.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I rule the honourable member out of order, and that is how it stands.

Mr LEWIS: How many opportunities do I have to speak on this measure?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! My ruling stands. I have ruled the honourable member out of order, and that is as far as I am going. I suggest that the honourable member should sit down and think about the position he is in. The question before the Chair is that the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Chairman, I ask you to indicate how it is that I am out of order by seeking to speak to this measure a second and, if I see the necessity to do so, a third time.

The CHAIRMAN: I will say this once more: if the honourable member for Mallee is prepared to speak to the Chair without reflecting on the Chair about the matters before the Chair then the Chair will be prepared to let him proceed. If he at all reflects on the Chair or proceeds to speak about something that has nothing to do with the recommendations before it, the Chair will not allow him to speak.

Mr LEWIS: I apologise to the Chair for any offence that any remark I may have made caused the Chair. I accordingly request that I be given permission to continue to participate in the Committee's consideration of these measures by so apologising.

The **CHAIRMAN**: The honourable member can proceed, but he is now on his second speech. The honourable member for Mallee. The question before the Chair is that the recommendations be agreed to.

Motion carried.

[*Sitting suspended from 10.30 to 1.35 a.m.*]

NATURAL GAS (INTERIM SUPPLY) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 4, lines 12 and 13 (clause 5)—Leave out 'and the terms and conditions set out in the first schedule'.

No. 2. Page 4, (clause 5)—After line 13 insert new subclause as follows:

(1a) The gas shall be supplied—

(a) at the price set out in, or determined under, section 7 or, with the approval of the Minister, at a price agreed from time to time by the Authority and the Cooper Basin producers;

(b) on terms and conditions set out in the first schedule or, with the approval of the Minister, on terms and conditions agreed from time to time by the Authority and the Cooper Basin producers.

No. 3. Page 4, lines 15 and 16 (clause 5)—Leave out 'terms and conditions set out in the first schedule' and insert 'requirements of this section'.

No. 4. Page 4, lines 36 to 40 (clause 5)—Leave out subclause (4) and insert the following subclause:

(4) The Minister shall—

(a) before making a determination under subsection (3)(d) give the Cooper Basin producers a reasonable opportunity to make representations to the Minister in relation to the determination;

(b) when making the determination have regard to—

- (i) representation (if any) made by the producers;
- (ii) the needs of industrial, commercial and domestic consumers in this State;

and

(c) not later than six months before the first day of January in the year to which the determination relates, give to the Authority and the Cooper Basin producers written notice of the determination and of the reasons for the determination.

No. 5. Page 7, line 36 (clause 12)—After 'within a' insert 'reasonable'.

No. 6. Page 7, line 39 (clause 12)—After 'recurred' insert 'and the default, or the recurrence of the default, was not due to circumstances beyond the producer's control'.

No. 7. Page 8, line 4 (clause 13)—After 'A person who' insert 'knowingly'.

No. 8. Page 8, line 8 (clause 13)—After 'Where a person' insert 'knowingly'.

No. 9. Page 8, line 31 (clause 15)—After 'Authority' insert 'or by the Cooper Basin producers or any of them or any of their officers or employees or any person acting on behalf of them or any of them'.

No. 10. Page 8, line 37 (clause 15)—After 'civil' insert 'or criminal'.

No. 11. Page 8, line 39 (clause 15)—Leave out 'enforce a' and insert 'enforce a loan agreement'.

No. 12. Page 9, First Schedule, clause 2, paragraph (a)—After 'unavoidable' insert 'or is necessary for the maintenance of equipment or other facilities'.

Consideration in Committee.

Amendments Nos 1 to 3:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 1 to 3 be agreed to.

These amendments provide a mechanism for any necessary variation of technical schedules and for prices to be set by agreement with the approval of the Minister, as an alternative to the pricing arrangements set out in clause 7.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 4:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be agreed to.

Proposed new subclause (4)(a) and (b) of clause 5 will provide the producers with the opportunity to make representations to the Minister in regard to determination of annual volumes for the years beyond 1987 and, importantly, will provide that the Minister have regard to any representations made by the producers. That was a point in relation to which there was some discussion earlier.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 5 and 6:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 5 and 6 be agreed to.

These amendments together constrain the Minister to act reasonably in relation to default or the occurrence of the default in relation to provisions in the relevant clause. This was also an area in relation to which some concern was expressed by the producers. This amendment is the result of a negotiation which took place yesterday morning.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 7 to 11:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 7 to 11 be agreed to.

These amendments are all companions. They extend the protections originally contained in the Bill with respect to liability to producers. Members would recall that in the Bill there is protection from liability for the Crown, the authority and for the agents of those two groups. The protection has now been extended to the producers. In relation to this matter, my paramount concern has been in relation to the position of industrial, commercial and domestic consumers in South Australia.

I have not, however, forgotten the rights of consumers in the State of New South Wales, and I advise the Committee that I am aware of the needs of those interstate consumers. Legislation of this kind requires even-handed dealing for all concerned, whether they be producers, suppliers or consumers in the various States of the Commonwealth. If it were solely a matter of proceeding as I had wished, then few of these amendments would perhaps have been favourably regarded. Given the circumstances, however, and taking all factors into account, I am sure that it is safe for the Committee to accept the amendments. I recommend them to the Committee accordingly.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 12:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 12 be agreed to.

It will make provision for any operational interruption which would occur as well as the previously unavoidable interruption. I can recall that one or two members had some qualms about the definition of 'unavoidable'. This tends to make the position clearer. I recommend that the House accept the amendment.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It appears that all these amendments ameliorate to some slight degree the impact of the Bill. However, none have any impact at all on the sorry history of deception, deceit and double dealing that has been part of this saga.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, Premier statesman who has a Government that agrees on the basic question of price. Two basic questions are to be settled: one being price and the other reserves, with independent experts to report in December. This Government cannot wait for that—it will lay to rest a lot of the questions in relation to reserves. However, the Government cannot wait until then. Agreement is reached in relation to price, but for obvious motives, perfectly known now to the House if not to the

wider public as yet, we have had this sorry saga of deception and deceit. Although the amendments ameliorate to some extent the impact of the Bill, it will remain to the everlasting discredit of this Government.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I do not intend to respond particularly to the remarks of the Deputy Leader, but all members should understand that the interests of the producers and the interests of the State do not necessarily have to be in conflict and I look forward, as a result of the passage of this Bill, to cooperation with the producers for the benefit of the State.

Motion carried.

MOUNT LOFTY BOTANIC GARDEN

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

DOG CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

RETIRING MEMBERS

The SPEAKER: There are few liberties that Speakers can take but, now that the Summons of the Council is completed, I refer to the fact that this evening in the forty-fifth Parliament there are three honourable members who, between them, have 45 years of service. I refer to the honourable member for Victoria, Mr Allan Rodda, the honourable member for Whyalla, Mr Max Brown, and the honourable member for Price, Mr George Whitten. All those gentlemen, in my view, share a common thread and it is, as best I could write them down: first, honesty; secondly, universal respect throughout the Parliament and the community; and, thirdly, the highest reputation (and we know, having been in politics, that if one survives for that length of time with the highest reputation there is certainly something going one's way).

As Speaker, and having no knowledge whatsoever of what the intention of the Government may be but knowing well that under the Constitution the forty-fifth Parliament must come to a conclusion in the near future, I would like to say on behalf of all honourable members and the staff of the Parliament that we regard ourselves as having been privileged to serve with Allan Rodda, Max Brown and George Whitten during the time of their membership of this Parliament and preceding Parliaments.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): By leave, in anticipation of what, obviously, you, Mr Speaker, anticipate, I take this opportunity of endorsing those remarks, in case I do not have a later opportunity to do so while these members are still members of the House.

Allan Rodda has been one of the most popular members on either side of this place throughout the whole of his career. He has been a particular friend of mine, and I know that we will all miss Allan Rodda's cheerful demeanour. I will certainly be sorry to see Allan leave this place. I wish him well in his retirement, whenever that may come.

Likewise, Max Brown has always been an amiable and very fair Chairman of Committees. He had that bit of humour that is required to get over the bumps, and I am quite sure that the Opposition will be sorry to see Max go.

Likewise, George Whitten. George keeps saying to me, 'I wish you wouldn't praise me up like that, because, if I was up for pre-selection, I would be sure to lose.' George has been one of the people in this place whom we have all respected. We wish George, in his retirement, a return to a measure of health that will enable him to enjoy that retirement. We have certainly appreciated his company. As I said only the other night, when I was laying it on the Government, George is one of the straight shooters in this place and we have enjoyed working with him. I take this opportunity of endorsing your remarks, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I had not realised that there was one person whom I omitted to mention in my remarks—perhaps because he is so much of an institution in this place—and that is the honourable member for Adelaide, Mr Jack Wright. There is no doubt that he shares that common thread of honesty, respect and reputation. He is truly an honourable person, as we all know, and I am sure that the Deputy Leader would agree.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I endorse those remarks also. I used to have a round or two with Jack Wright when he was Deputy Leader. However, when members are about to retire, they always seem to me to improve. We all respect Jack Wright's personal qualities and I know that the contribution he made to the Labor Party was immeasurable. We will also miss him in this place.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction): When I came into this place, I made a promise to myself that I would never stand up and give condolences to families of those members who died. I am happy to say that, whilst I am on my feet, all these people we are talking about are still hale and hearty. I would like to single out two of them, and that is not to say that I do not have high regard for Allan Rodda and Max Brown. I would like to pay my own personal tribute to George Whitten. George was a person who encouraged me from the very beginning to stand for this Parliament, and for his sins, he eventually managed to—can I say—arrange the numbers so that I got preselection. I came to regard the Hon. J.D. Wright as my mentor. He was the one who, when we were in Opposition in 1979, encouraged me to take my place on the shadow front bench and gave me advice and encouragement. For that I will ever be grateful.

Mr RODDA (Victoria): I would like to acknowledge your remarks, Mr Speaker. As you know, I served in the Air Force during the Second World War, and this occasion reminds me of a little fellow of Italian descent, an air gunner. When he was leaving, he would say, 'Now sir, this is the last time.' There were several last times, and I hope, by some strange coincidence which is peculiar to politics, that perhaps I will be here again. However, that is in the hands of people who are quite capable of making decisions, and I shall leave it to them.

It has been a wonderful privilege to be a member of this place. I am the last of 'Playford's', and that dates me, so I suppose it is time that I did bow out. I remember coming into this place in 1965, the year that Playford lost office. Prior to that election, we attended Playford's office in the Treasury and he said to us, 'Well, boys, you have all got your policy speeches. Go out and do a good job, and I will see you all in a fortnight in my office.' The election was duly held, and we all know what happened in 1965. Frank Walsh was Premier. I had the date religiously recorded in my diary, so I reported to Playford's office downstairs in the basement. There was one secretary, a Miss Minson, and

I told her that I was to see Sir Thomas. She said, 'Sit down, he's not back yet.'

The old fellow came in but took no notice of me. Instead, he sat down in his chair that he had sat in for years, took up a school pen and started busily writing. I suppose he sat there for five minutes and never said a word to me. I was feeling quite uncomfortable. 'Lad,' he said, 'Where are your mates? You don't think they have forgotten their appointment?' 'I think they have a damn good reason to forget it, Sir Thomas,' I replied. He said, 'My word, you are a discerning young man.' I have been told that Sir Thomas never swore and was extremely religious, and I was not swearing either, although I was prone to say a few things. He said, 'Well lad, we will give these so and so's buggery', and I nearly fell off the chair.

That was my initiation to Parliament with Playford. They were a wonderful three years. Frank Walsh was my Premier and came into the dining room and said, 'Are you young Rodda?' He nearly pulled me from my chair, and he said, 'I am the boss around here. If you have not got what you want, it's your own fault. If you want anything come and see me.' They were two great personalities. Since then we have seen many things happen and I have had the privilege of serving in this place under distinguished Premiers, and I include the present Premier among them. It has been a wonderful experience.

Most of my time has been in Opposition, but I can say to the District of Victoria that, irrespective of the colour of the Government, most of the things I have asked for have sooner or later been obtained. Gavin Keneally is now sitting opposite and I know I plagued him and another Minister about the road from Keith to Mount Gambier. I was pleased to see the announcement that they are to spend \$3.5 million, with federal assistance, on that project. That has been par for the advancement we have made since my time as member for the district. It has also been par for the State. It proves that we are going in the right direction.

Some people reading history see nothing but despair and desolation, but when I look back I see that we have come a long way. There is an enormous future in front of us. It has been a great privilege to serve with all of you. There is a great future for South Australia and all you young fellows and girls—you will be pleased to know that I was the second speaker sticking up for the girls at Saskatchewan a few weeks ago. The girls have brought some lustre into the place. The reactions of the male never cease to amaze me. We have had some very useful examples set by the ladies who have graced this place, and I am sure that this will continue.

In conclusion, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the House who have been wonderful to me through the years. We have had a few arguments, but they have only been skin deep. I always remember the Whips: as Playford told me, they were people to fear. He said, 'The Whip is charged with the responsibility of seeing that the Leader or Premier never suffers for the want of a majority. If they do, it's on the head of the Whip. These Whips are here to see to it that you and your colleagues line up.' That is true. I have seen John Oswald and my colleague John Trainer in this position. John Oswald has been Opposition Whip for only a few weeks, and John Trainer has been Government Whip for three years. They have certainly upheld the tradition and instilled fear, and they have seen to it that they keep the Parliament going, carrying out the wishes of the Leader and the Premier. I had a sojourn in the Whip's position in the second Parliament in which I was a member when the Hon. T.C. Stott was Speaker. That, too, was a position to fear.

It has been a very grand experience to have been a member of this place, and I will take away very happy memories. I will come back and see you occasionally, but

if you think I am going to retire that is not true. When I leave this place I will go straight into action in another capacity. When I really retire, members will be saying sad things about me. Thank you for having me at your place.

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): Mr Speaker, I wish to say a few words about the time I have been in this place, in response to your very kind remarks. I thank you very much, Sir, for what you said and I thank the Deputy Leader also. He and I have had our moments, and we have come out fighting at times. He never bought me a drink, although we have got very close to it. I think on one occasion he did put his hand in his pocket, but nothing came out. Apart from that, the Deputy Leader and I got on fairly well, at least for the last three years, anyway.

I want to thank Onlooker: he did me a very great service, because he told everybody in South Australia how bad I was as far as cooperating was concerned. I had an apology from him halfway through the debate on the Casino Bill, so from a person like Onlooker I thought that was rather a tribute. I thank him, too, for what he finally wrote about me.

I will not say that I will miss you all. I can assure members that this time next year I will be sleeping soundly on the normal rail of my bed at home, and I will not be thinking about them at all. I do not want any member to leave the House tonight with the idea that somewhere along the line I will have memories, because I do not believe in them. However, I have enjoyed my 16½ years in this place.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott: Don't forget to ring us when your horse is running.

Mr MAX BROWN: I will always ring certain members when my horse is going—usually after the race. In conclusion, I think it can be said that we were never born to this rather queer world of politics—sometimes we arrive here by accident, sometimes by design, and sometimes through hard work. It is a queer world—no-one in their right mind would be here at 2.10 a.m. making a speech. However, one meets some very good people in this queer world of politics. Generally, politicians have a bad name out in the real world and I think that sometimes that is very harsh and very wrong, because we are not the sorts of people that the media and a lot of other people would normally talk about. I have always found that, although all of us have our little peculiarities, in the main we are very sincere and genuine people trying our best to do what we can for the benefit of people and for the world we live in. I thank you all very much.

Mr WHITTEN (Price): I want to thank many people. First, I thank the trade union movement and the Labor movement in general. My background is in the trade union movement. I become a little emotional at times and I get myself into trouble by saying what I think—but I never recoil from saying what I think. I have never been afraid to say what must be said. I get myself into a lot of trouble because of that, and I will probably get myself into trouble this time.

First, I thank the trade union movement for giving me the privilege and honour to represent the District of Price in this Parliament. I thank all my constituents who saw some merit in me by returning me over four elections. At each election I think my majority improved. I do not attribute that to myself alone but to people like Don Dunstan and John Bannon. I wish people would get it out of their minds that elections are won by individuals. An election is won because of the Party and because the Leader of the Party is just that—a leader.

I have served under three Leaders in the Labor Party, and I have the highest regard for all of them: Don Dunstan, Des Corcoran (a great bloke), and now John Bannon. The

other day I said that John Bannon is performing as well as, if not better than, Don. In saying that, I mean a lot. Some members have had a few words to say tonight. I have been critical of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition at times. However, I say thank you to Roger for the things that he said about me tonight. On Wednesday night, Roger Goldsworthy had all his friends—the gas producers—around him, but he was still prepared to say, 'George Whitten is not a bad bloke; he is a straightshooter'. Of course, I had to have a rejoinder, and I said, 'Do not let any of my colleagues in the Labor Party hear that, because once they do I am finished.' It would be the kiss of death, and Roger knows how that was meant.

I want to say something about my colleague in the corner: the member for Napier and Minister of Housing and Construction. I do not believe that all the criticism he at times levels at me is warranted. He blames me for getting him into this Parliament. He said that I organised the numbers and I have got him into all this trouble. He says that he would never have been a Minister if I had not got him into this place in the beginning.

I want to comment on that because it is something that has been on my mind all my life. Terry Hemmings contested a seat in the Legislative Council and was No. 7 on our ticket. Terry thought that he could possibly win that seat, but of course he had no hope. I said, 'Terry, behave yourself, do the right thing and you will be in a worthy place. I do not want you to vegetate in a place that should never exist.' He has since become the member for Napier and a Minister of the Crown, and he is doing a great job. Do not blame me for all the problems that he says he has.

I am very proud that I have had the honour and privilege to be Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee. A member of the Public Works Committee who retires at this time is also present tonight, and I refer to the member for Victoria, Allan Rodda. One could never find a better and more honest and sincere gentleman. He is a person

upon whom I can always rely and he is sincere and honest. Thank you very much, Allan, for all the assistance that you have given me on that committee.

The committee is not a political one—it is honest and sincere. I was a little concerned when it was suggested that the Public Works Standing Committee does not always look into things as thoroughly as it should. I think that was a false statement. Be that as it may, this is not the time to be critical.

I also mention my boilermaker mate, Max Brown, the member for Whyalla. I have known him for many years. Tonight, I will let you into a little secret: Max Brown, the member for Whyalla, when he was an apprentice, was known as Ginger Meggs. You would never believe that he was a shy little fellow.

One person who has not been mentioned very much tonight is my old mate Jack Wright, the member for Adelaide. He is a hell of a good bloke, and is honest and sincere. I owe Jack Wright a lot. I have known him a long while and I have always been supportive of the member for Adelaide. I have an extremely high regard for him. I regret that he is not able to follow me in the electorate of Price. He was endorsed for that seat, which I vacate at the next election. I very much regret that Jack's health does not allow him to carry on, but I can assure you that the endorsed candidate for the Labor Party, Murray Delane, will win Price and will win it at the next election by the greatest margin of any member in this House.

I once again thank you, Mr Speaker, and thank the Parliament. I wish particularly to thank the constituents of Price for allowing me the privilege to represent them in this Parliament.

ADJOURNMENT

At 2.15 a.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 19 November at 2 p.m.